DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 421 879 FL 025 379

AUTHOR Taylor, Lorraine Mills
TITLE The Arizona Elementary Foreign Language Mandate: Instructional, Curricular, and Assessment Outcomes in the Mesa Schools.
PUB DATE 1997-12-00
NOTE 171p.; Master's Thesis, Arizona State University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Masters Theses (042) -- Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Curriculum Design; Educational Policy; *Elementary Education; *FLES; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Public Policy; Public Schools; Second Language Instruction; *Second Language Programs; State Standards
IDENTIFIERS *Arizona; Mesa Public Schools AZ

ABSTRACT

A study investigated the instructional and curricular changes made in seven Mesa (Arizona) public elementary schools as a result of a 1989 state mandate for second language instruction at the elementary school level. In the schools under study, Spanish second language instruction is integrated into the core curriculum. The study examined instructional and curricular changes, identified current Spanish resources and materials in use by the schools, presented results of a 1995 assessment at the third grade level, and informed teachers and administrators of the importance of foreign language program continuation in the district. Data were derived from personal interviews and questionnaires administered to teachers, principals, media specialists, a state official, and two employees of the district who directed Spanish instruction. Results indicate that although teachers felt Spanish instruction was an important part of the curriculum, they themselves needed more training in Spanish. Half the teachers preferred a foreign language specialist to teach Spanish; 57 percent of principals preferred a trained specialist and 43 percent chose school-wide staff training. Training in practical teaching techniques were selected by teachers over training in theory of language learning. The 1995 third-grade assessment was found useful in holding teachers accountable for Spanish teaching. Contains 78 references. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 421 879

THE ARIZONA ELEMENTARY FOREIGN LANGUAGE MANDATE: INSTRUCTIONAL, CURRICULAR, AND ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES IN THE MESA SCHOOLS

by

Lorraine Mills Taylor

A Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Lorraine Taylor

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

F L025379

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

December 1997

THE ARIZONA ELEMENTARY FOREIGN LANGUAGE MANDATE:
INSTRUCTIONAL, CURRICULAR, AND ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES
IN THE MESA SCHOOLS

by

Lorraine Mills Taylor

has been approved

November 1997

APPROVED:

Leticia Salinas, Chair

Gail Guntermann

Barbara A. Laffoon

Supervisory Committee

ACCEPTED:

Department Chair

Anthony J. Brazel

Dean, Graduate College

ABSTRACT

The present study focused on seven elementary schools in Mesa, Arizona, where Spanish is integrated into the core curriculum of grades 1-6. The status of foreign language instruction underwent a shift of importance when the Arizona State Board of Education passed the Elementary Foreign Language Mandate in 1989 (R7-2-301.02). The purpose of this investigation was to discover what instructional and curricular changes were made due to the passage of said mandate, to identify current Spanish resources and materials utilized by the seven schools, present results of the Mesa Public Schools Spanish Language Assessment administered to third graders in 1995, and to inform administrators and teachers of the importance of foreign language continuation in the district. This study based its theoretical framework on the Sociology of Language, which involves language planning, policy planning and status planning. Data for this research were derived from personal audio-taped interviews and questionnaires administered to elementary teachers, principals, media specialists, a State official and two employees of Mesa Public Schools who directed Spanish instruction. The data revealed that although teachers felt Spanish instruction was an important part of a child's curriculum, they needed more training to heighten low proficiency levels in Spanish. Fifty percent of the teachers selected a foreign language specialist as their preference for instruction. Fifty-seven percent of the principals preferred a trained specialist and forty-three percent chose school-wide training for their staff. Training in grammar and pronunciation, teaching methods, games and songs were selected by the teachers over training in theories of language learning. Teachers had created and found additional teaching aids such as flash cards, bulletin board displays, holiday activities, Hispanic students, fluent Spanish speaking volunteers, Spanish books, etc. in order to teach Spanish. Teachers felt the district video program needed more real-life objects with additional characters and preferred a native speaker of Spanish versus a non-native speaker. Media Specialists said more bilingual, Spanish, and pictures books were needed in the Media Centers to enhance instruction. And lastly, the 1995 Spanish Foreign Language Assessment caused positive results because the teachers were held accountable for their Spanish teaching.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First of all, I would like to acknowledge Adams School for their willingness to cover many times for me as I attended classes, meetings, interviews, etc. in preparation for this thesis. Their support in the pilot study was invaluable as they continuously gave verbal support through encouraging words. My grade level team over the years has given me emotional support and kept me informed of important information. I specifically would like to acknowledge the moral support given to me by my teacher partners Arlene Stalzer, Susan Hughes and Cyndy Barton. As well, during the data collection process, I would like to thank the secretaries at Adams School, Amy Shoaf, Kate Keeler and Patti Miller, who answered a multitude of telephone calls and took many messages regarding potential people to interview for data collection. I am certainly grateful for an understanding and encouraging principal who understood the importance of higher education. Dr. Isherwood has been patient and understanding as I gathered data across the district.

Secondly, I would like to acknowledge the assistance of my thesis chair, Dr. D. L. Galindo, who has not only given me constructive criticism through the years as a professor and teacher, but has spent hours listening to me as a person and as a friend. I admire her strength and her dedication to the Linguistics field and appreciate her ability to encourage academic excellence in myself. As well, Dr. Lafford and Dr. Guntermann have encouraged me through their expertise in Spanish and knowledge of foreign language instruction.

Thirdly, I wouldn't have been able to complete this thesis without the years of emotional support from my family in Wyoming, my close friends here in Mesa, and the love and motivation from my husband, Mark Taylor. They have carried me when I was down and helped me to continue on when I didn't think I could last another class, paper, test, semester or hour on the computer.

Lastly, I want to dedicate this thesis to all the wonderful people who so graciously accepted involvement in this study. It restores one's faith in the education system as I spent one-on-one time with so many dedicated principals, teachers and media specialists. During April and May of 1996, the teachers were extremely busy but they volunteered their time and I've gained many new friends in the process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES ix

CHAPTER ONE

I Introduction 1

II Review of the literature 3

A. Language Planning and Language Policy 4

B. Minutes from the State Board of Education 6

C. History of FLES 12

D. Media-based programs 14

III Research questions 18

IV Hypotheses 18

V Organization 19

CHAPTER TWO

I FLES in other countries 20

II FLES in the United States 22

A. Florida 25

B. Georgia 26

C. Pennsylvania 26

D. Tennessee 27

III FLES in Arizona 28

A. Elementary Foreign Language Conference: Workshop on Technology 28

B. ASSET 29

C. "La Escuela" 30

Page

D. Arizona Elementary Foreign Language Programs 31

E. Gilbert Unified School district #41 (Maricopa County) 34

F. Flagstaff Unified School District #1 (Coconino County) 35

G. Tucson Unified School District (Pima County) 36

H. Mohawk Valley School District #17, Roll, Arizona (Yuma County) 37

I. Osborn School District #8 Phoenix, Arizona, (Maricopa County) 38

IV FLES in Mesa Public Schools 39

CHAPTER THREE

I Data collection 44

II Description of sample 45

III Instrumentation 46

IV Data analysis 46

CHAPTER FOUR

I Research question #1 48

II Research question #2 53

III Research question #3 58

IV Research question #4 71

V Research question #5 77

VI Research question #6 81

VII Research question #7 89

Page

CHAPTER FIVE

I Summary of findings 95

II Conclusions 97

III Limitations 103

IV Recommendations. 104

A. Parent Volunteer Program 104

B. Language Proficiency Outcomes 105

C. Teacher Inservice Training 106

D. Foreign Language Priorities and Assessments 107

NOTES 110

REFERENCES 111

APPENDIX

A QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS 116

B QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PRINCIPALS 122

C QUESTIONNAIRE FOR DIRECTOR OF SCIENCE AND SOCIAL STUDIES 125

D QUESTIONNAIRE FOR EDUCATION PROGRAM SPECIALIST 128

E QUESTIONNAIRE FOR RESOURCE TEACHER 131

F QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MEDIA SPECIALISTS 133

G VERBAL SCRIPT FOR RECRUITMENT OF SUBJECTS 136

H LETTER OF CONSENT FOR ADULTS 138

I RECRUITMENT LETTER FOR TEACHERS 140

J RECRUITMENT LETTER FOR PRINCIPALS 142

K QUESTIONNAIRE FOR FAMILY LIAISON 144

L MESA PUBLIC SCHOOL SPANISH TEST DESCRIPTION 147

		Page
M	MESA PUBLIC SCHOOL MISSION STATEMENT, PHILOSOPHY, AND STUDENT GOALS	150
N	ELEMENTARY FOREIGN LANGUAGE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN	152
O	ELEMENTARY PROGRAM	154
P	RESOURCES FOR FLES	156
Q	ELEMENTARY FOREIGN LANGUAGE ENDORSEMENT	159

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Apache Foreign Language Instruction Implementation Results from June 30, 1992	33
2	Third Grade Elementary Foreign Language Plan for Mesa Public Schools	40
3	Gender	45
4	Types of training to assist in Spanish instruction	50
5	Teachers' choice of instructional support	51
6	Specific type of training requested by teachers	52
7	Teacher rating of receptiveness towards the instruction of Spanish	54
8	Principals' perception towards the instruction of Spanish	55
9	Motivation for teachers to use Spanish in the classroom	56
10	District Spanish program assessment	61
11	Creation of Spanish video program by teachers	63
12	Other changes in the creation of a Spanish video program by teachers	65
13	Language choice for instruction if given the option	67
14	Ideal teaching situation for Spanish instruction (teachers)	72
15	Speak Spanish	74
16	Description of Spanish proficiency	75
17	Ideal teaching situation for Spanish instruction (principals)	76
18	Resources and materials for teaching Spanish	78
19	Other choices for resources and materials used by teachers	78
20	Other types of evaluation for assessment of Spanish acquisition	88
21	Importance of teaching Spanish (teachers)	91
22	Importance of teaching Spanish (principals)	92
23	Importance of teaching Spanish (media specialists)	93

CHAPTER ONE

I. Introduction

"He who knows no foreign language has never really learned his own" (Grittner, 1969:22) was a statement made by Goethe, a German philosopher. In Arizona, children as early as first grade are putting that concept into practice. Where did Foreign Language in the Elementary Schools (FLES) begin? What is its status in Mesa, Arizona? These are vital questions as mandates, legislation, funding, interpretation of rulings and education continue to change. As consistent as the swinging pendulum, second language instruction in the elementary schools moves back and forth as it attempts to become a solid part of a youngster's curriculum and an accepted factor in the community.

Since the passage of Arizona's Elementary Foreign Language Mandate (R7-2-301.02) of 1989, there has been little public information regarding how each school district in Arizona has adapted to this foreign language policy.[1] Therefore, the purpose of this investigation is to examine and describe what has transpired in one school district in particular, Mesa Public Schools, with regard to Spanish instruction since the mandate.

The research focused on Mesa Public Schools (N=7 elementary schools) for the following reasons: 1) it had the potential to provide information for incoming teachers to the district; 2) it could serve as a possible foundation for the establishment of future Spanish programs; 3) it could be a potential planning tool for future curriculum development; 4) it would hopefully promote an awareness of the strategies currently being used in elementary classrooms; and 5) it would serve as a potential resource of communication among the more than 40 elementary schools that are ethnically, economically, and academically diverse.

Since communication has been limited among the elementary schools, the investigation has the following goals: 1) to discover curricular changes due to the passage of the Arizona Elementary Foreign Language Mandate, 2) to identify the resources and materials that the seven schools use in the teaching of Spanish, 3) to present the results of the Mesa Public Schools Spanish Language Assessment (1995) given to third graders

across the district as an example of an outcome strategy that has been a direct result of the language mandate, and 4) to share information with administrators and teachers in order to emphasize the importance of foreign language continuation in the district.

As a result of attending the ALL (Advocates for Language Learning), SLAC (Second Language Acquisition for Children) and ACTFL (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Language) Conferences in California in November of 1995, I discovered what other states were achieving in foreign language instruction (FLI).[2] When asked by other participants of the conference what effects the mandate had had on Arizona and what was occurring in Mesa, this researcher lacked information. Therefore, it is the hope that this research will offer data to educators, administrators and the general populace about Spanish instruction within Mesa Public Schools.

Secondly, due to economic and educational trends, FLES programs are constantly changing. Mesa Public Schools are facing program cuts and changes to the curriculum. The Spanish program that was started, and never completed for the intermediate grades, will be discontinued due to funding and replaced by a program called *Saludos*. Therefore, this research becomes potentially important for the Mesa Public Schools Board of Education and those in Curriculum Development as they create, change, and adapt to the needs of foreign language in a school district comprised of over forty-eight elementary schools.

Thirdly, if strong FLES programs continue in the elementary schools, the effects will be far-reaching. Studies (Hamayan, 1986; Jacobsen, 1989) have shown that students who begin to master another language at an early age score higher on tests of verbal intelligence and mental flexibility. And in a Louisiana study (Rafferty, 1986) of more than 13,000 third, fourth and fifth graders, students who had taken a foreign language significantly outperformed those who had not on standardized tests of reading and mathematics. Garfinkel & Tabor (1987) studied the relationship between elementary school foreign language in grades four through six and found results to support improved academic performance for the foreign-language group. In addition, these investigators found that students of average academic ability showed greater gains on a standardized

reading test than did those of above average ability. Met (1991) proposed that the opportunity for foreign language study should not be restricted only to those of high academic levels but to all students. Furthermore, Met (1991:67) states: "While a few other studies have shown that students who take a foreign language in elementary school perform no better academically than those who do not, the foreign language group is still at an advantage: they have gained knowledge, skills, and attitudes that their classmates have not." Foreign language study is a process that involves years of continued focus. In the WHY FLES* brochure, supported by the AATSP (American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese), the AATF (American Association of Teachers of French), and Dr. G. Lipton, this concept is verified:

> We know that children pick up languages easily at an early age. The optimum is a long sequence of foreign language learning beginning in the early grades which promotes proficiency, allows pronunciation to be learned effectively, and helps to produce appreciation of other cultures. Foreign language instruction in elementary schools is educationally sound and is successful in the United States and throughout the world. A recognition of all types of FLES* programs is important for all children, giving them an opportunity to expand their horizons and to begin the foundation of language and multi-cultural understanding. In the opinion of many educators, teachers, parents and administrators, no child's elementary education is really complete without the study of a foreign language.

In conclusion, Arizona should be a leader in the continuance of quality, durable FLES programs because of its proximity to Mexico and its diverse ethnic populace. Dr. William Hopkins, a professional diplomatic interpreter, (1992:148) describes the "ethnic diversity of the United States as one of our greatest assets. We have available to us in this country a mother lode of ethnic knowledge and ethnic experience." Mesa, Arizona needs to use this valuable resource, its diverse population of children, and develop strategies to solidify foreign language as a priority.

II. Review of the literature

The investigation of foreign language education in Arizona is based on the theoretical framework of the Sociology of Language. Fishman (1971:217) states

> the 'sociology of language' examines the interaction between these aspects of human behavior: use of language and the social organization of behavior....the sociology of language focuses upon the entire gamut of topics related to the social organization of language behavior, including not only language usage *per se* but also language attitudes, overt behaviors toward language and toward language users.

Within this framework, Fishman (1985) considers language planning a subtopic of the sociology of language. Cooper (1989:44) further clarifies that "inasmuch as language planning is an example par excellence of 'overt behavior toward language' and inasmuch as it attempts to influence 'language usage' and is itself influenced by 'language attitudes,' the study of language planning is well within the purview of the sociology of language." Therefore, the concept of Language Planning (LP) serves as the foundation for this thesis.

A. Language Planning and Language Policy

What is Language Planning? Many have offered their definitions. Cooper (1989:45) states that "language planning refers to deliberate efforts to influence the behavior of others with respect to the acquisition, structure, or functional allocation of their language codes". McArthur (1992:580) defines LP as "the attempt to control the use, status, and structure of a language through a language policy developed by a government or other authority." According to Weinstein (1980:56) "language planning is a government authorized, long- term, sustained, and conscious effort to alter a language's function in a society for the purpose of solving communication problems." Wardhaugh (1992:346) adds to the definition by claiming that LP " may involve assessing resources, complex decision-making, the assignment of different functions to different languages or varieties of a language in a community, and the commitment of valuable resources."

LP, according to Kloss, (1969) who first distinguished the two language planning foci, may be classified as being of two types: 1) status planning (SP) or 2) corpus planning (CP). Wardhaugh (1992:347) states that status planning:

> changes the function of a language or a variety of a language and the rights of those who use it. For example, when speakers of a minority language are suddenly denied the use of that language in educating their children, their language has lost status. Alternatively, when a government declares

> that henceforth two languages rather than one of these alone will be officially recognized in all functions, the newly recognized one has gained status.

In contrast, Wardhaugh (1992:347) defines corpus planning as that which

> seeks to develop a variety of a language or a language, usually to standardize it, that is to provide it with the means for serving every possible language function in society. Consequently, corpus planning may involve such matters as the development of an orthography, new sources of vocabulary, dictionaries, and a literature, and the deliberate cultivation of new uses so that language may extend its use into such areas as government, education, and trade.

Which of these two types of planning applies to Arizona? Crystal (1987:364) states that "in status planning changes are proposed in the way a language/variety is to be used in society (thus altering its status) - as when it is permitted for the first time in law courts or in official publications." The study of foreign languages in the elementary schools of Arizona is seen as a change of status in the use of a selected language. On February 28, 1988, the Arizona State Board of Education voted to establish an Elementary Foreign Language Task Force (EFLTF) comprised of educators, administrators, and parents. The Board of Education approved the following charge to the EFLTF (Basha, et al, 1988:1)

> 1. The Task Force shall gather and summarize information on foreign language programs in elementary schools in Arizona and nationwide to include instructional models and materials.
> 2. The Task Force shall consider the implications of foreign language in the elementary school for teacher training, in-service training and certification.
> 3. The Task Force shall consider and identify sources of funding for elementary foreign language programs.
> 4. The Task Force shall recommend a course of action to the State Board.

The Task Force met fives times from April 1987 through December 1988 when the report was presented to the State Board of Education. The group discovered that second language instruction in Arizona was primarily offered at the high school level. They recommended that to promote foreign language proficiency and preparation of students in today's world, foreign language instruction needed to begin in the elementary grades based on studies showing that mastery of a second language requires a length of from four to six years.

The Task Force recommended that funding be made available to school districts in order to implement the three types of program models: FLES, Intensive FLES, and Immersion; and that a state level staff member be assigned to coordinate the foreign language programs in the elementary schools in Arizona.

As Language Planning was investigated by the Task Force, a Language Policy was passed by the Arizona State Legislature. According to Weinstein, (1990:5, 185):

> language policy and planning means deliberate and conscious choices of language form and/ or language function made by important institutions believed to be capable of long-term implementation over a significant area and among a significant population and determines the formal status of various indigenous and foreign languages, their value as media of instruction and examination in educational institutions at all levels, their use in government--the courts, legislative deliberations and the executive agencies,-- and their role in the increasingly dense networks of communication between modern government and society.

As a result of the Language Planning developed by the Task Force, a Language Policy was created. Consequently, Language Planning led to a Language Policy.

When did foreign language first become an issue at the Department of Education in Arizona? The following data represent an overview of the process that led to the Language Policy in the State of Arizona. The bolded dates act as a sequential time-line that does not cover every step in the process but is considered to establish background for the later ruling that had impact on foreign language instruction in Arizona. Data gathered are from the State Board of Education minutes.

B. Minutes from the State Board of Education

According to the Minutes from **March 8, 1961** of the State Board of Education and State Board of Vocational Education, the agenda had been rearranged in order to discuss the teaching of foreign languages in the elementary schools. The secretary of the board stated that several people had been interested in foreign languages already and wanted to continue with their programs. Several problems were discussed, such as the "legality of the teaching of foreign languages in the common schools, the certification of the teachers, the time alloted (sic) to this subject in the school day, etc." (Minutes, March 8,

1961, p. 1). Counsel for the schools from the Attorney General's Office informed the board "that they have the authority to authorize the teaching of foreign language in the elementary schools with options" (Minutes, March 8, 1961, p.1). A motion was made that the Board advocate to the local school boards within the boundaries of the law to "experiment with options in foreign language courses" (Minutes, March 8, 1961, p. 1). The motion was unanimous and the Board agreed that contact be established with teachers who were instructing a second language in the elementary schools and report back to the Board at a later date on the progress that was achieved.

In **October 1968** a progress report was given to the board by Mr. J. O. Maynes, a Consultant for Modern Foreign Languages and Director of the Migrant Children Education Division with regards to foreign language teaching for secondary and elementary schools. Mr. Maynes shared results of a survey done by his department on foreign language enrollments in Arizona Secondary Schools during 1968. He also reported that "many of the elementary schools have updated their foreign language departments or have begun such service for their students. With 108 high schools in the state, only two do not have a foreign language in their curriculums" (Minutes, Oct. 28, 1968, p. 5). In **February 1969** the Board discussed reinforcing the requirements of foreign language secondary teachers in Arizona.

During the 1980s foreign language issues began to take a more active role. On **February 28, 1988**, the Arizona State Board of Education voted to establish an Elementary Foreign Language Task Force (EFLTF). It met five times between April 1987 and December 1988. The EFLTF had a membership of 13 people consisting of superintendents, school board members, professors, parent representatives, teachers, students, members of the State Board and the Department of Education. The Task Force gathered and reviewed numerous reports and documents regarding elementary foreign language programs in the United States and other countries. The report was submitted to the State Board in **December, 1988,** and accepted by the board on **March 27, 1989.** A motion was made to "authorize the continuance of the task force to draft an abstract

outlining the benefits to be derived from introducing foreign language at the elementary level" (Minutes, March 27, 1989 p. 3).

The report was comprised of the following topics: 1) Why Foreign Languages in Arizona Elementary Schools?, 2) Elementary Foreign Language Program Models, 3) Characteristics of a Good Elementary Foreign Language Program, 4) Summary and Recommendations, and 5) Appendices consisting of articles relating to foreign language instruction, sample foreign language programs, ACTFL provisional program guidelines for foreign language teacher education, position statement on foreign language in elementary schools by the National Council of State Supervisors of Foreign Language (Nov. 1988), Foreign Language Educational Publisher Representative List, and finally an Annotated Bibliography of Materials for Elementary Foreign Language Programs.

Acting as consultants to the State were members of the task force, the bilingual director, the program specialist, and according to the program specialist, perhaps the most influential person who consistently raised the importance of foreign language instruction in the elementary schools was President of the Board at the time of the vote, Mr. Eddie Basha. With his interest, foreign languages became an important issue during board meetings (Personal interview, Program Specialist, March, 1996).

During the minutes of **May 22, 1989** the president of the board had a guest speaker brief the Board on "current legislative and funding issues related to elementary foreign language programs...that in July the Board will be asked to evaluate the issue of elementary foreign language programs and that he thinks it would then be appropriate for the Board to mandate a foreign language for all students at the elementary level" (Minutes, May 22, 1989,p.1). Mr. Basha called Ms. N. Mendoza to brief the Board on current issues relating to foreign language programs. She presented what some of the potential challenges might be in considering this type of a mandate, including whether the students would become proficient in the language and whether all schools would be required to offer such a program. Also, she discussed if schools are required to offer a foreign language, would all students be responsible to enroll in the program, at what grade level the language program would begin, and the number of years involved in the language study.

On July 24, 1989, during a study session, the Board had discussed foreign language education. During a meeting on **July 25, 1989,** the Board asked that "a policy statement be developed regarding foreign language programs in the elementary schools" (Minutes, July 25, 1989, p. 3). And a member made a motion that the "Board direct staff to draft a rule amendment, consistent with the policy statement adopted, for the inclusion of foreign language in the elementary schools as part of the requirements for completion of common school" (Minutes, July 25, 1989, p. 4-5). A motion was made and the decision was unanimous in the affirmative for the requirement of foreign language study in the elementary grades 1-8.

On **November 27, 1989,** a Public Hearing occurred on the proposed rule, R7-2-301.02. This rule discussed the core subject areas to be taught in the common schools (grades 1-8), including: Social Studies, Language Arts, Arithmetic, Literature, Health, Science, Music, Visual Arts and Foreign language (including modern, classical and American Indian). Furthermore, it stated that:

> 1. Beginning with the 1991-1992 school year, all common schools, grades 1-8, shall provide foreign language instruction, as defined in paragraph A.9., in at least one grade level. Each year thereafter such schools shall provide an additional grade of foreign language instruction to include all grades, 1-8, by the 1998-1999 school year.
>
> 2.The local governing board of each school district shall set clearly defined goals for achievement of foreign language proficiency.
>
> 3. District programs shall include a continuous evaluation of student proficiency (State Board of Education, 1989).

Due to budget challenges in starting a foreign language program, many district officials and representatives of several education organizations requested a delay in the initiation of the foreign language programs. On **March 26, 1990,** the Attorney General's Office requested some "changes to the language in the adopted rule relating to foreign language instruction in the elementary schools, R7-2-301.02" (Minutes, March 26, 1990, p. 6). No information was given in the minutes as to the nature of the changes.

On **February 25, 1991,** the superintendent addressed the item of Elementary Foreign Language Instruction and R7-2-301.02, Subject Areas To Be Taught in the

Common Schools stating that "it has been expressed by a number of districts that they are having difficulty preparing programs to meet the elementary foreign language instruction requirements to begin in the 1991-1992 school year." The superintendent asked that "the Board discuss a consideration to delay the implementation of these programs for one year". (Minutes, Feb. 25, 1991, p. 3).

Many school district administrators and representatives were given the opportunity to speak. Mesa Public Schools had their representative present. A presentation was given by Northern Arizona University expressing their efforts to assist districts to develop and provide programs. A discussion was held to amend the existing rule through the formal rule process.

On **December 9,1991,** the Board dropped the requirement that specific grades in each of the subjects be taught. The paragraph about one grade level being added each year to foreign language was also deleted. On **December 20,1991,** the State Board amended the wording of R7-2-301 and stated that the previous ruling for the years of 1991-1992 would be changed to 1992-1993, and for all grades to receive the required instruction by the years 1999-2000. The reason for the change was to allow additional time for school districts to implement the plan and research funding avenues.

On **February 24, 1992,** a Public Hearing occurred on the proposed new rule (R7-2-301., Minimum Course of Study for the Common Schools and repeal of R7-2-301. and R7-2.301.01). Representatives from Northern Arizona University addressed the Board, discussing the maintenance of the elementary foreign language requirement. The superintendent stated "that the proposed new rule was an effort to move towards requiring the demonstration of competencies in the required subject areas as opposed to time spent in a class and that there was a need to be more specific about the Board's intent when interpreting the rule regarding subjects to be 'taught' and subjects to be 'offered" (Minutes, Feb. 24, 1992, p. 8).

During the General Session that same day, the Board members discussed the issue of giving children foreign language instruction and the costs of offering such programs. A decision was made that efforts on this subject continue and that the current requirement not

be amended. The motion carried by a 5-3 vote. A clarification was made by members of the Board who opposed the motion by saying their votes against the motion were because of financial concerns and not in opposition to foreign language instruction per se. The Board also voted to approve the wording in the proposed new rule of R7-2-301 with the amendment of paragraph A.9. to be changed to read, "Foreign or native American language, (includes modern and classical)".

In a memorandum to school district superintendents from the State Superintendent of Public Instruction on **February 26, 1992**, the Superintendent stated:

> I know of the interest all of you share in the foreign language mandate first discussed and voted into rule in 1990. Last year the State Board voted to delay the implementation until the 1992-1993 school year for at least one grade with the addition of another grade per year until foreign language was offered to students in grade 1-8. Monday, the State Board discussed the foreign language mandate again. I want to report directly to you on that discussion and subsequent actions taken by the Board. We all are aware of the difficulty faced by schools in Arizona with the reduction in availability of appropriated funds. The Board, too, understands this and heard some compelling testimony to that effect yesterday. Nevertheless, on a 5-3 vote, the Board decided that the importance of second language learning for students in Arizona is critical in these times of global economies and competitiveness. Therefore, districts should continue to prepare for the advent of foreign language instruction during the 1992-93 school year as specified earlier by the board. Part of this earlier requirement is that each district tell the Board in a brief report by June 30,1992, what preparations and plans have been made by each district for the 1992-1993 school year. The selection of the language, method of instruction and type of curriculum remains the choice of each school. The Foreign Language Essential Skills are nearly ready for Board approval and will be sent to you in the next few months (Bishop, 1992).

On **March 23, 1992**, the Board adopted the Foreign Language Essential Skills document as presented. And on **October 26, 1992**, the board accepted on behalf of the State of Arizona, the "funds appropriated under the Foreign Language Assistance Act of 1988 and approve the apportionment of those funds" (Minutes Oct. 26, 1992, p. 2).

On **September 30, 1996**, the Board received a petition from the Arizona School Boards Association requesting an amendment to R7-2-301 specially paragraph A.9., which required instruction in foreign language in the elementary schools. A host of speakers including singer Linda Ronstadt shared reasons for continuance of foreign

language instruction in the elementary schools. A motion was made that the Board deny the petition for the fact that foreign language instruction was in the best interest of the State. The motion failed by 3-4 and was once again considered by the Board in October. The next month on **October 28, 1996**, a discussion was once again made by the Board and several speakers addressed this issue. After the discussion, a motion was made to "deny the request from the Arizona School Boards Association as it is not in the best interest of the State the students in State or the State Board of Education" (Minutes, October 28, 1996, p.2). The motion was carried with a narrow margin of 5-4.

And lastly, six months later, on **April 28, 1997**, the Board adopted the Foreign Language Standards, which describe the rationale behind foreign language instruction; the description of language abilities for each level (kindergarten, grades 1-3, 4-8, 9-12, Honors) including: readiness, foundations, essentials, proficiency, distinction; and the seven Standards with emphasis in the following strands: communication, culture, connections, comparisons, and communities. The standards reflect what the students need to know and do in order to successfully develop skills in a foreign language. The standards also demonstrate the integration of foreign languages into the rest of the curriculum to coordinate education and to further a firmer understanding of one's own culture and language as well as the target's language and culture.

Based on this chronological overview, FLES language planning in the state of Arizona spans four decades. It was influenced by teachers who had previously been involved in foreign language instruction and members of a State Board who felt foreign language needed to be a part of a young child's experience in order to prepare them for the global world in which they live.

C. History of FLES

It is essential to provide a brief history of FLES as it relates to language planning. FLES* (pronounced FLESstar) is the general term used to describe all types of elementary school foreign language programs (Lipton, 1990). There are basically three types of programs: 1) sequential FLES, 2) FLEX, and 3) Immersion. Sequential FLES is the

study of foreign language for two or more years with a focus on listening, speaking, reading, writing and culture. FLEX (Foreign Language Experience) is a program that introduces a second language but does not have proficiency as a goal. Immersion (whether total or partial) focuses on the use of the foreign language by teachers and students throughout the school day. Mesa's current district foreign language program would be considered a FLEX program because it is an introduction to a foreign language with limited proficiency expectations, although there are individual sites which use FLES programs.

When did FLES begin? According to Lipton (1994), FLES, although not a "new" phenomenon, has appeared in cycles over the years in various forms. In Lipton's summary of FLES* history she quotes Donoghue (1968:334) as saying "foreign language instruction has always been available to *some* children in this country since shortly after the settlement of Jamestown. It has never yet been available to all of them." In Heining-Boynton's (1990) summary history of FLES, there are references (Kelley 1969) that written evidence of FLES appeared as early as the first century A.D. Throughout time, foreign language has been an important part of children's education. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in the United States, Latin and Greek were part of the curriculum. Thomas Jefferson was an advocate of instruction in modern foreign languages and Benjamin Franklin believed that ancient languages should be preceded by a study of modern languages. And with German immigration in the nineteenth century, German was soon offered in some schools but its popularity fell after World War I as did the United States' sentiment toward foreign languages in general.

Then after World War II, a revitalized interest in foreign language study took place, partly due to the Russians' orbiting of Sputnik. After the passage of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, funding was provided for the training of foreign language teachers. McLaughlin (1977) reports that there was an increase in all language programs, including FLES. Andersson (1969) reports that by 1960 all fifty states had FLES and 1,227,000 pupils were enrolled in an elementary school foreign language program in 8,000 elementary schools. Unfortunately, by the end of the sixties, very few FLES programs remained, mainly due to discontinued grant monies or the fact that school districts had to

change or cut funding. Plus, we see in many parts of the country that creative educational programs were cut by the "return to the basics" attitude. One cannot overgeneralize this drop in language programs to every school district in the nation, but there have been some recurring themes, conditions and trends common to FLES programs of the fifties and sixties.

What is the current status of FLES programs? Lipton (1994) notes that after a decline in the 1970s, many new programs evolved in the 1980s. Although there are few up-to-date statistics, according to Lipton (1994) one study done by Rhodes & Oxford in 1987 shows that there were FLES programs in approximately 17% to 20% of all elementary schools (kindergarten through grade 8) in the country. Rhodes & Oxford (1988) reported that 17% of the responding public schools and 34% of private schools offered foreign language instruction. Schools with various types of programs showed 45% had FLES, 41% had FLEX, 12% used Intensive FLES and only 2% used Immersion. An update of elementary programs currently in use throughout the United States will be published by the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL), and written by Rhodes and Branaman in the Fall of 1997.

Current statistical information is a challenge to obtain because FLES exists in both public and private schools, and the schools have different organizational patterns such as kindergarten through grade 5 or kindergarten through grade 6, and it is difficult to contact all elementary schools in the United States. However, as stated by Lipton (1994:3), "the statistics concerning the three major program models are as follows: approximately 48-49% of all FLES* programs are in Sequential FLES; approximately 48-49% of all FLES* programs are in FLEX or Exploratory; approximately 2-3% of all FLES* programs are in Immersion or Partial Immersion."

D. Media-based programs

Besides the three major program models mentioned above, another common model used by Mesa Public Schools is the media-based model. It is used extensively by educators across the over 48 elementary schools. It was created to compensate for lack of

funding needed to hire language specialists and due to the fact that many teachers in Mesa did not speak Spanish fluently or had a low proficiency level when the mandate was issued.

Before the media-based program was completed, outside media programs such as *Amigos* and *Saludos* were used by Mesa Public School. Both programs are currently being used during the 1997-1998 school year to help teachers incorporate Spanish into their curriculum. *Amigos* was developed by the Center of Extended Learning (CEL) at The University of Tennessee. It consists of a series of thirty 15-minute television lessons that teach Spanish to children in kindergarten through second grade. Funding for the project was received from a grant proposal from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) in December, 1987. With additional funding from CPB, completion of all the lessons took place in June, 1990 (Stephens, 1989). In March, 1989, *Amigos* was pilot tested by RMC Research Corporation in Hampton, New Hampshire, with 505 children from four sites: South San Francisco, California; Brighton, Colorado; Louisville, Kentucky; and Framington, New Hampshire. The participants were selected to demonstrate diversity of geographic location, community size, ethnicity, and sex. There were eleven different instruments used to evaluate child and teacher (N=11) reactions to the first two lessons created. The results from the evaluative instruments which consisted of interviews, observations, questionnaires, reaction logs, etc. demonstrated children's positive reactions, attention, interest and curiosity of the programs and showed an increased desire from the children to learn Spanish. They strongly preferred the segments dealing with songs and games, which have great application to the media-based program developed by MPS. Teachers rated the effectiveness of the program on a five-point scale. High scores were given for its portrayal of Hispanics (4.36) and its use of music and songs (4.27). The lower ratings were for visual reinforcement of the geography and culture concepts (2.63) and the amount of time spent on geography and cultural concepts (2.27).

Amigos is designed to be used by teachers who have no previous knowledge or a limited comprehension of Spanish. It is modeled after FLEX programs, where basic Spanish words and phrases and exposure to Hispanic culture are evident. Other goals are

to create a curiosity in geography of Spanish speaking countries and reinforce skills and concepts taught in the regular elementary school curricula. The Corporation for Public Broadcasting states:

> At a time when television and other technologies permeate every facet of American life and promise to become even more pervasive in the future, it is critical that public television form a strong and viable partnership with the nation's educational community to harness the power of technology in the service of education. When well designed and used, television and other technology applications have proven to be enormously effective instructional tools. Further, broadcast and non-broadcast technologies can make quality education equally available to all schools and children nationwide. While the nation's resources are strained and its problems are expanding, the direct application of technology can provide efficient and cost-effective solutions to many of the nation's most pressing educational problems (Stephens, 1989:1069).

The *Saludos* program was developed by the Foreign Language Department and the District Television Department of the Broward County Public Schools in Florida. It is a series of 15 minute lessons using modern techniques to capture the attention of its viewers. The objectives of the *Saludos* Program are as follows:

- Demonstrate oral and aural knowledge of vocabulary appropriate for everyday situations.
- Recognize the alphabet and simple word ordering in the Spanish language.
- Read and write simple sentences within the frameworks previously learned at the appropriate grade level.
- Identify customs pertaining to Hispanic culture including forms of non-verbal communication.
- Participate in cultural programs and fairs which provide opportunities to acquire and expand his/her knowledge of Hispanic cultures.

(Badía, et al, 1992).

Saludos was evaluated in 1989-1990 by an external evaluator by using pre- and post- tests; an attitude appraisal from parents, teachers and students; and documentation of cultural events by school. Those students who had been participating in the program for one year or more had significant increases in posttest scores. Approximately 70% of the parents felt that the program had a positive influence on children's learning Spanish, 60% of the teachers felt second language learning was an important part of the education process, and over 80% of the students felt the Spanish program helped them "with other

activities in the schools, feel better about themselves, and get along with people" (Badía, et al,1992:191).

Media-based models can present both culture and language-related material through their use of special effects to create lively activities. But the success of a media-based program ultimately depends on the willingness of the classroom teacher. Students also feel far away from the program and are experts at shutting the program out. Curtain & Pesola (1994:42) explain:

> The key to success of media-based programs, in addition to the quality of the media product itself, is the quality and intensity of the follow-up. In a successful program, the media will supplement and not replace time spent with a foreign language teacher. Media-based programs in the past that haven't adequately provided for classroom interaction with a qualified teacher have been extremely disappointing in their results. Many have disappeared entirely, leaving behind an extremely negative attitude toward foreign language instruction.

In sum, over the years there has been a change in the status of Spanish instruction in the elementary schools of Arizona as a result of extensive Language Planning leading to Language Policy mandated by the Arizona State Legislature. The Arizona Foreign Language Mandate has prompted many school districts to organize their foreign language instruction. This mandate has influenced Mesa Public Schools to develop curriculum in order to satisfy the language goals of the State. Through Language Planning and Policy, foreign language instruction has become an integral part of the school curriculum. Language Planning and Language Policy have provided the foundation to conduct research in the Mesa FLES programs by means of examining one school district so as to highlight the status of foreign language instruction. This thesis will be based on instruction by teachers who have implemented the status change of Spanish into their curricula either through the use of the district's media-based programs or through other language programs. Therefore, it is the hope of the researcher that this thesis will offer recent and informative data for the district as they change, implement and adapt to National Standards as well as the standards created by the state of Arizona.

III. Research questions

This research project was designed to answer the following seven questions:

1) What kinds of preparation (foreign language classes, methodology, study and travel abroad, workshops and inservices, etc.) have teachers had to enhance foreign language instruction and what types of training and instructional support are preferred?

2) What are the perceptions of teachers and principals towards Spanish instruction with regards to receptiveness and motivation?

3) What curricular changes have occurred in Mesa Public schools since the passage of the foreign language mandate?

4) According to teachers and principals, what is the ideal teaching situation for the instruction of Spanish in the elementary schools given the current situation?

5) What are the resources and materials that the seven schools use in the teaching of Spanish?

6) Regarding assessment, what impact did the 1995 Spanish Language Assessment , which was given to third graders, have on the instruction of Spanish by teachers of this grade level?

7) Do Mesa teachers, principals, and media specialists feel Spanish instruction is an important part of a student's curriculum?

IV. Hypotheses

The following seven hypotheses were generated:

1) Some teachers will have prepared for foreign language instruction by taking workshops and training versus the options of additional teaching materials and/ or a budget. The majority of the teachers will select practical types of training such as learning games and songs and teaching methodologies versus classes in the theories of language learning.

2) The perception of Spanish instruction by the teachers will score at least a 3 on a scale from 1 being the lowest to 5 being the highest. Principals will perceive Spanish instruction in a positive role versus a negative role. Teachers will be more motivated by district influence and curriculum than by the state mandate to teach Spanish.

3) With the passage of the Arizona Mandate, Mesa Public Schools has created an instructional plan for each grade level so that Spanish will continue to be taught whether foreign language instruction is mandated or not.

4) Teachers will elect having a foreign language specialist in the elementary school versus individual foreign language training. Principals will select school-wide training.

5) Mesa teachers will have created additional materials like games, songs and activities and found other resources and materials to teach Spanish in the classroom besides the use of the district's Spanish program.

6) It is proposed that the Arizona Elementary Foreign Language Mandate has caused positive results towards Spanish instruction in Mesa. As a result of the mandate, the district created a Spanish Language Assessment to document learning which caused the teachers to be held accountable for the instruction given.

7) The majority of teachers, principals, and media specialists will concur that Spanish instruction should continue in the district as a strong part of the curriculum because children are more receptive to learning a foreign language, and because it impacts Arizona's economic competitiveness and forms part of the educational continuum for foreign language selection through high school and college.

V. Organization

Chapter Two is a review of FLES programs in other countries, in the United States, in Arizona, and lastly in Mesa Public Schools. This chapter covers each area in a very broad sense and serves to inform the reader of how FLES has been implemented and adopted as a viable language policy from a global to a local perspective.

Chapter Three discusses the procedures and methodology utilized for the study; it includes a description of the data collection, the sample population, the development of the instrumentation and the analysis of the data.

Chapter Four consists of a detailed discussion of the findings based on the proposed seven research questions. Data analysis is qualitative, offering results in descriptive prose as well as by means of tables demonstrating frequency counts and percentages.

Chapter Five contains a summary of the findings, the conclusions, the limitations, and the recommendations of the study.

CHAPTER TWO

Chapter Two provides a brief overview of FLES in other countries, in the United States, in Arizona, and lastly within Mesa Public Schools. The discussion contextualizes FLES from a macrolevel to a microlevel perspective in order to allow the reader to become familiar with foreign language programs.

1. FLES in other countries

Rosenbusch (1995a) suggests that examining programs in other countries can offer a new perspective on the teaching of foreign languages for educators in the United States. According to a detailed report prepared by Martin-Bletsas (1992), given at a meeting of the European Communities (EC) education ministers, foreign languages in the EC member states has shown a widespread growth in the teaching of languages in the FLES setting. Countries such as Italy, France, Spain, Greece and Scotland have introduced national reforms and language programs to facilitate second language learning. The age of the children taught varies from one member state to another; however, foreign language was found to be taught to students most commonly between the ages of 8 and 11 (Rosenbusch 1995a).

Lipton (1994) reports that there is a growing interest in promoting a foreign language in the elementary grades in Canada with the focus on English and French, and in Mexico second language programs are beginning in the first grade. There are pilot programs for early language learning as well in Denmark, England, Scotland, France, Germany, Greece and the Netherlands. Peck (1993 as quoted by Lipton) states: "an early start is both desirable and common. . . if Europeans are genuinely to feel part of a community, whether as members of the EC or as citizens of one of the 35 states taking part in the Council of Europe's educational and cultural programs, then the need for introducing languages at the earliest possible stage demands the highest priority and continuing support" (Peck, 1993: 91-92).

Member states of the EC such as Denmark, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg already had a specified foreign language in their curriculum base. In other countries, English was chosen by many, with French running a close second in Germany. French has been taught in Germany, Greece, Spain, Italy, Portugal, and other English-speaking countries. German is found taught in countries such as Spain, France, Italy, Portugal, and Scotland. Spanish is taught in France, Italy and Scotland. And there are diverse opportunities for foreign language study in France, where languages such as Italian, Portuguese, Russian and Arabic are emphasized. Normally a foreign language is taught anywhere from 2 to 3 hours per week in the EC member states; in contrast, in certain regions of Luxembourg and Belgium, a second language can be taught from 5 to 8 hours per week.

In Canada, the Commissioner of Official Languages (1994) reported that French and English over the past 20 years have increased steadily from 13.4% in 1971 to 16.3% in 1991. According to the report, the youth of Canada are " the most bilingual generation in Canadian history" (p. 141). The main emphasis for the French-speaking students is to maintain a high level of proficiency in their first language, French. Later, English is usually not taught until the 3rd or 4th grade, which allows students the necessary time to establish their first language before beginning their second. However, English is required for all French-speaking students from elementary through the high school level.

Rosenbusch (1995a) reports a great interest in teaching other languages besides English and the aboriginal languages in Australia since the 1970s, according to a study by Clyne (1991). The results showed there are 150 aboriginal languages in use in addition to the more than 100 languages other than English. In the 1970s short-term grants were made available to schools to establish community language programs (Ingram, 1994). In a 1983 national study by Clyne (1991) of Australian students, there were nineteen languages offered for instruction. At the primary school level, languages with the highest percentages were: Hebrew (49.6%), aboriginal languages (19.1%), Italian (17.8%), Arabic (10.6%), and Turkish (10.0%).

Ingram (1994) reports that from 1986 changes in the political and economic situation have forced an "economic-determinist viewpoint of language and education" (Rosenbusch, 1995a:22). In 1991, the Australian Language and Literacy Policy (ALLP) adopted a national language policy that stressed the importance of language as an economic issue. Australian English, according to the ALLP, is the national language, with other priority languages identified: aboriginal languages, Arabic, Chinese, French, German, Indonesian, Italian, Japanese, Korean, modern Greek, Russian, Spanish, Thai, and Vietnamese (Ingram 1994). Unfortunately, little is mentioned in the ALLP about second language FLES programs, but Ingram notes that "all state and territory policies give high priority to increasing primary school study of languages other than English, and most make it compulsory..." (Rosenbusch, 1995a:23).

We can conclude that FLES is occurring in many places throughout the world. Its importance has been demonstrated in country after country including very diverse programs and goals in the United States.

II. FLES in the United States

Over the past century FLES programs in the U.S. have reflected a wide array of curricula and philosophies. In the Statement of Philosophy for the Standards for Foreign Language Learning proposed by ACTFL, it was stated:

> Language and communication is at the heart of the human experience. The United States must educate students who are linguistically and culturally equipped to communicate successfully in a pluralistic American society and abroad. This imperative envisions a future in which ALL students will develop and maintain proficiency in English and at least one other language, modern or classical. Children who come to school from non-English backgrounds should also have opportunities to develop further proficiencies in their first language (Executive Summary, 1995).

There is a growing number of state-mandated FLES programs coming to life as they respond to the public's insistence that languages be taught in the elementary grades. In 1993, a consortium made up of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, the American Association of Teachers of French, the American Association of

Teachers of German, and the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese received financial support to create standards for foreign language education in grades K-12. Foreign language was the final subject area to receive federal support to develop national standards as part of the America 2000 education initiative. A task force of 11 members was created to define content standards in order to state what students should know and what they should be able to do in any given foreign language. The standards are a dramatic change from the previous practice of foreign language education, where rote memorization of vocabulary, grammar, rules, and dialogues was the norm. In the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning: Preparing for the 21st Century* , the task force specified eleven standards, divided among five goal areas that encompass the various reasons for learning a foreign language which have become known as the Five C's of Foreign Language Education:

- **Communication** (Communicate in languages other than English);
- **Cultures** (Gain knowledge and understanding of other cultures);
- **Connections** (Connect with other disciplines and acquire information);
- **Comparisons** (Develop insight into the nature of language and culture); and
- **Communities**, (Participate in multilingual communities at home & around the world).

The standards provide sample progress indicators for grades 4, 8, and 12 in order to verify whether students are learning and demonstrating progress towards each standard. For example, standard 1.2 states that "students understand and interpret written and spoken language on a variety of topics" (Executive Summary, 1995). In Grade 4 students would share the main ideas of oral narratives such as familiar fairy tales. It is important to keep in mind that:

> The standards are not a curriculum guide. While they suggest the types of curriculum experiences needed to enable students to achieve the standards, and support the ideal of extended sequences of study that begin in the elementary grades and continue through high school and beyond, they do not describe specific course content, nor recommended sequence of study. They must be used in conjunction with state and leoal (sic) standards and curriculum frameworks to determine the best approaches and reasonable expectations for the students in individual districts and schools.
>
> (Executive Summary, 1995)

On March 31, 1994 the signing of the *Goals 2000: Educate America Act* , a federal initiative to motivate and support reform throughout each state's educational system, resulted in foreign language becoming a secure part of the education system. Students in grades 4, 8, and 12 would have to meet standards in all areas including "challenging subject matters" such as foreign language. And it is no longer listed as an enrichment course but part of the core curriculum, joining the long time subjects of Reading, Writing, Mathematics, etc. With the passage of *Goals 2000: Educate America Act*, foreign language education, along with all other core subjects areas, has been called upon to make a change in order to provide quality education for children. Donato & Terry (1995) found that 40 states had foreign language mandates specifying that a school must offer at least two years of second language instruction to *all* children. According to their report, ten of those states included in their core elementary curriculum a study of foreign language. Thirty-eight states have developed or are developing content standards for English as a second language (ESL). And, twenty states are planning to implement performance standards for foreign languages.

Many of the mandates don't dictate what languages are to be taught nor require a certain program model. Which programs to offer, which languages, how to recruit experienced teachers and what curriculum to use are decisions to be tackled by the individual schools and districts where the mandates exist. Lipton (1994:8-9) explains that:

> Too often, administrators in school districts responding to a state mandate choose program models which comply with the mandate in a token fashion, which many foreign language educators on upper levels are delighted to have a state mandate for an early start in foreign languages. Others, however, are dismayed when no additional monies are provided, and when there are few opportunities to train the hundreds of teachers required for a massive, state-wide mandated program. One exception to this is the mandate in the state of Kentucky. Here, the foreign language mandate is tied to the systemic reform of all elementary and secondary school programs in the state. Where FLES* is part of the overall statewide reform, it is easier to solve the many problems of a state foreign language mandate.

Some mandates have shown greater insight than others as they have been included in some "states' general educational goals or frameworks, and most of them stress the

need for second language acquisition by children for purposes of communication and international understanding" (Lipton, 1994:9).

Many states such as Arizona, Louisiana, Oklahoma, North Carolina, Kentucky, Georgia, Texas, Hawaii, Pennsylvania, Florida and New York mandate foreign language instruction, according to Lipton (1994). Kansas City, Missouri, is under "a court-ordered desegregation mandate which includes a foreign language magnet component" (Lipton, 1994:9). Kentucky and Oklahoma are two of the most recent states to have mandated foreign language programs for second language acquisition by children. In North Carolina, their program of study has been operational for several years (Lipton, 1994).

To demonstrate what is occurring across the United States, four states-- Florida, Georgia, Pennsylvania, and Tennessee--will be targeted so as to describe the type of foreign language instruction offered. As stated earlier, this serves as an overview for the reader and is not meant to cover FLES programs in their entirety. There are many more diverse programs even within these states. This serves to give the reader a brief synopsis of what four states have done with foreign language instruction.

A. Florida

Broward County, Florida, comprising cities such as Fort Lauderdale and Hollywood in the south-east section of the state, is the second most populous county with a rising population of 24.7% (Badía, et al, 1992). Over the past seven years (reference point from 1992) in grades K-12 the school population has increased, showing a growth rate in Black and Hispanic minority students to exceed the rate of growth of non-minority students. In order to adjust to these demographic changes, the county designed a foreign language program for English-speaking students grades K-5 focusing on understanding Hispanic culture and learning the Spanish language through the teaching of sounds, basic vocabulary, word order, and sentence structure and providing an emphasis in oral communication coupled with a positive attitude toward learning languages. The Spanish classes are taught for sixty minutes weekly in twenty-five elementary schools in the district. The teachers are certified and fluent in Spanish and have attended the 1990

Elementary Foreign Language Summer Institute as well as completed course work in foreign language methodology.

To better comply with Florida's objectives and to assist teachers who weren't as fluent, the Foreign Language Department and the District Television Department of Broward County Public Schools developed its own set of supplementary audio-visual material, which was the beginning of *Saludos*, a television series which utilized various techniques (integration of cartoons, sound affects, etc.) to attract and sustain the attention of young viewers. This program has been used by Mesa Public Schools since 1988, first as a pilot program by six schools and currently used in the intermediate grades.

B. Georgia

In Atlanta, Georgia, at the Lovett School, there is a combination of a language/potpourri FLEX program in Grade 6, which introduces students to different foreign languages and their cultures (Marcos, 1996). Also, this program was established for any children who had taken French in Grades 1-5, as an opportunity to study other languages before they had to commit to a two-year study of French, Latin, German or Spanish in Grades 7 and 8. The purpose of this kind of program is to provide awareness of the connections between languages, develop an appreciation for world cultures, teach some basic expressions in the foreign language, and expose students to the many different forms of communication that exist. A new language is introduced every week and a half including introductions to hieroglyphics, Braille, sign language, Greek, Latin, Hebrew, Chinese, Japanese, Russian, German, French, Spanish, Hindi, Swahili, and Arabic. The students are taught that all languages are exciting to learn. The curriculum was developed by program staff and uses two resources, called *Learning About Languages* (Lubiner, 1992) and *Exploring Languages* (Kennedy, et al, 1994) as guides for teachers.

C. Pennsylvania

In Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, at the Falk School, Donato & Antonek (1994) report on a three-year pilot program to teach Japanese to all students K-5. After a great deal of

study and discussion with parents, teachers, principals and university language teaching specialists during the summer of 1992, the Falk School Board decided to authorize and provide some modest funding for an initial three-year pilot program in Japanese. This was the first type of FLES program offered, as well as the first time Japanese had been offered at any level. The instruction consisted of one 15 minute lesson each day, five days per week for every student from kindergarten through grade 5. The time allotted to teach Japanese was taken from homeroom activity periods as well as other subject areas. A native Japanese speaker was recruited and trained during the summer prior to the official start-up of the program. Lesson format was based on proficiency-based instruction as described by Omaggio (1993) and Schrum & Gilsan 1994), meaning that the "lessons were designed thematically and included content, contexts, functions, and accuracy appropriate for the novice proficiency range" (Donato & Antonek 1994:367). Even though instruction was for only 15 minutes a day, all students from grades K-5 achieved some degree of novice-level proficiency in Japanese, with the highest skill achievement being pronunciation.

D. Tennessee

At Crieve Hall Elementary a program was developed and then initiated in October of 1993 to teach Spanish to kindergarten through fourth grade students (Duzak, 1994). Spanish was taught for one hour for each class on a weekly basis. The Metro school budget did not provide for foreign language instruction in early elementary grades, so the principal of Crieve Hall turned to grants from the Tennessee Department of Education and the Tennessee Foreign Language Institute (TFLI) to find a qualified teacher. The teacher, a native speaker from Venezuela, immerses the students in Spanish by using a conversational approach instead of the textbook approach with conjugation and vocabulary. She uses games, puppets and activities appropriate for each grade level. The children also receive cultural information about Spanish-speaking countries in Mexico and South America. And, the children receive instruction in Spanish that focuses on what the children are learning in their regular education classes.

German classes were offered in Milan, Tennessee, at Polk-Clark School starting in the 1990's (Short, 1995). Polk-Clark School, having a population of approximately 500 students, was a pilot school offering foreign languages through the TFLI. Funding for the program came from the state and other local businesses. TFLI helped initiate the program in Milan through a grant of $15,000. The teacher, also a native of Germany, taught the students in each class for one hour a week in the 25 classes. The goal of the school is to increase instruction of German all through the elementary grades up to the high school level.

III. FLES in Arizona

Foreign language in the elementary schools has been noted in many places throughout the United States, and in Arizona, the State Board ruled that foreign language in the elementary schools be taught in grades 1-8.. This section has four purposes: A) to explain a part of the Elementary Foreign Language Conference; B) to discuss ASSET, (**A**rizona **S**chool **S**ervices through **E**ducational **T**echnology), a program at Arizona State University in Tempe, Arizona; C) to describe "La Escuela" (The School), a foreign language video-based program from The University of Arizona (U of A); and lastly, D) to briefly describe Arizona elementary foreign language programs as first articulated from the June 30,1992, Foreign Language Implementation Form and from more recent data gathered through journals and phone conferences.

A. Elementary Foreign Language Conference: Workshop on Technology

In April of 1990 at the "Elementary Foreign Language Conference" in Mesa, Arizona, there were workshops on methodology by Met & Curtain, a presentation on magnet schools by Garcia, a presentation by Rhodes on teacher preparation and a session on technology. During the Technology Session, a panel discussion involving Arizona educators and other language specialists occurred. Representatives from various school districts and personnel gave presentations about foreign language instruction through the

use of technology. Maricopa County teachers from the Chandler, Cavecreek, and Mesa Public Schools District (the researcher herself who shared about the use of *Saludos*); a superintendent from Cochise County, Bisbee, Arizona; coordinator of Educational Television, from MPS; director of ASSET; professors from Northern Arizona University (NAU) in Flagstaff, Arizona, sharing the Distance Learning Demo; representatives from the Arizona Department of Education; and finally, representatives from the University of Tennessee, who shared a live teleconference explaining their K-2 *Amigos* Spanish Curriculum live from satellite. This Technology Session created an awareness of what was currently happening in Arizona regarding foreign language instruction through technology and what resources were available for use.

B. ASSET

After the mandate for teaching foreign language in the elementary schools was given in Arizona, many schools requested that ASSET, an acronym for Arizona School Services through Educational Technology, help them meet this responsibility. Through information gathered, it was decided that the immediate need was not for foreign language instruction per se but for preparing teachers and administrators to plan and implement whatever foreign language curriculum they would adopt. There was a need to develop a forum in which to share ideas, express concerns, examine philosophies and resources, and demonstrate proven teaching strategies. Therefore, ASSET LIVE was created via KAET at Arizona State University to share a series of 60-minute live, interactive staff development teleconferences, delivered via satellite twice monthly for educators across Arizona.

Starting in May of 1990 the teleconferences were different in that they were produced by a partnership between ASSET and Mesa Public Schools and that the format of the teleconference featured videotaped lessons being presented by Arizona teachers with students in Arizona schools. The focal point of each lesson was the demonstrated teaching strategy. The production could be videotaped as a model lesson to add to schools' staff development tape library as a reference for teachers and recopied with permission from ASSET. On May 23, 1990, a trial run was presented, featuring the present researcher and

her third-grade students as they studied Spanish utilizing the program *Saludos*. Through Educational TV, the teacher was videotaped teaching a Spanish lesson, and then as an enrichment tool, *Saludos* was demonstrated. The researcher helped the MPS District pilot the program during 1989. Later, many schools became involved in using the Spanish program. Currently, in Arizona, many counties use *Saludos* to help teachers who don't speak Spanish and as an enrichment tool for their classrooms.

C. "La Escuela"

In early 1991, representatives from the University of Arizona met with the Pima County Superintendent of Schools and a consortium of five Tucson area Arizona school districts: Amphitheater, Flowing Wells, Sunnyside, Tucson Unified, and Marana. They developed a video-based program for teaching foreign languages. It included a set of master videotapes, a complete set of master teaching materials, an introductory staff development tape, and sixty 15 minute lessons which would last enough for twice a week for an entire school year. Included within each lesson was a three five -minute segment with suggested classroom activities. Benefits of the program, according to *The University of Arizona Extended University Fact Sheet : La Escuela Foreign Language Video-Based Program,* were an affordable cost ($5,000 for districts with up to 1,000 students; $7,500 for districts with 1,000-5,000 students; $10,000 for districts with more than 5000 students), quality lessons, innovative materials, tremendous flexibility, availability and a relationship with The University of Arizona. The curriculum and teaching materials were written by a team of bilingual teachers and were coordinated with the Arizona Foreign Language Essential Skills. The program was piloted in first grade classrooms during the 1991-1992 school year. Currently, according to the language coordinator for Tucson School District, "La Escuela" is being used by the Marana, Tucson and Amphitheater School Districts in Pima County. Additional curriculum has been developed using audiotapes and written lessons with activities involving such things as food, songs, and other language related activities. A native speaker was used as well as curriculum guides to assist the teachers. There has been extensive staff development, methodology workshops

as well as the creation of teaching materials for teachers (Personal interview, Language Coordinator for Tucson School District, September, 1997).

D. Arizona Elementary Foreign Language Programs

On May 30,1992, each school district across the state of Arizona was notified by the Department of Education that they would be required to send a form called the "Elementary Foreign Language Implementation Plan" (see Appendix N) pursuant to the State Board Rule R7-2-301.02 to the Arizona Department of Education by June 30,1992, describing their plan for implementing foreign or native American language instruction in the elementary grades 1-8. Also enclosed with the letter was a copy of the Foreign Language Essential Skills document developed by the Foreign Language Essential Skills Committee of the State Board of Education.

To better understand the school systems of Arizona, the Department of Education prepared an explanation of Arizona's public school system during 1992-1993. It consisted of a table showing a state summary of number and type of public schools per county with a description of the number of districts and schools per the elementary, high school, unified, accommodation, and special schools. Then by county, the enrollment, number of schools, the district personnel, and addresses were attached. In the introduction to the explanation, the state superintendent asserted that:

> The public school system in Arizona is divided into elementary, high school, and unified districts. The elementary school districts include kindergarten through eighth grades. The high school districts include the ninth through twelfth grade. The unified school districts include kindergarten through twelfth grade. There are some junior high schools, but most of these include just the seventh and eight grade and are therefore in the elementary districts. Some school districts may have one or more schools. However, many districts have just one school. Some districts do not operate a school but instead transport their students to a school in another district. All school districts that have one or more schools and those that transport their students are noted on the attached list. Each school district operates independently, maintaining its own student and personnel files, doing its own buying, hiring of personnel, and having its own salary schedules (Arizona Dept. of Education, 1994).

According to the state summary for 1992-1993, there were 222 school districts, 935 elementary schools and 173 high schools. Not included in these summary counts were the Accommodation Districts, Non-Operating and Special Programs.

Presently, there are fifteen counties in the state of Arizona, which covers a land area of approximately 113,510 square miles. Each school district within these fifteen counties was required to inform the state of their intentions regarding foreign language implementation by completing the plan sheet (see Appendix N). To better comprehend the data, the researcher selected Apache County because it had all eleven districts reporting and would demonstrate diversity of languages chosen and program style. Apache County is in the farthest, northeast corner of the state.[3] According to the summary for Apache County (Arizona Dept. of Education, 1994), there were four elementary districts with four schools and seven unified districts with 23 elementary schools, totaling eleven districts in all. Table 1 explains what each district within Apache County chose for the June 1992 plan sheet.

TABLE 1

Apache Foreign Language Implementation Plan Results from June 30, 1992

Apache County					N=11 Districts				
District	1	2	3	4	5	a	b	c	6
Alpine	Y	FLES	N	N	Spanish	2xw	K-8	30m	Y
Chinle	Y	FLES	Y	Y	Navajo	D	4	10m	Y
Concho	Y	FLES	N*	Y#	Spanish	2xw	1-4	20-25m	N*
Ganado	Y	2 Way B	N	Y	Navajo	1wd3	1-2	40-50m	N+
McNary	Y	FLES	N/A	Y	Spanish	1xw	1,6-8	1hr	Y
Red Mesa	Y	FLES	Y	Y	Navajo	2xw	1	40/80@	Y
Round Valley	Y	FLEX	Y	Y	Spanish	wkly	1	15m/30l	Y
St. Johns	Y	FLEX	Y	Y	Spanish	2xw	1-2	1hr/wk	N
Sanders	Y	FLES	Y	Y	Navajo	D	k-1	20-30d	Y
Window Rock	Y	FLES/PI	Y	Y	Navajo	2xw	k-2	30m/es	N
Vernon	Y	FLES	N	Y	Spanish	-	1-6	-	N

Key:

1. Developed plan for Elementary Foreign Language instruction Y=Yes N=No
2. Selected program model: Foreign Language Experience (FLEX), Foreign Language in the Elementary School (FLES), Two Way Bilingual (2 Way B), Partial Immersion (PI)
3. Coordinated elementary school plan with high school program Y=Yes N=No.
4. Inservice for teachers Y=Yes N=No.
5. Language chosen=Spanish or Navajo
   a. Frequency
   •1/2xw=one/two time(s) a week.
   •D=daily.
   •1wd3=1 week daily out of 3 wks
   •wk=per week
   •wkly=weekly w/volunteer teachers
   b.Grade Levels
   • K- grade 8
   c.Allocated Time
   • @=40 min. per class/ 80 min. a week
   •d=days •l=lessons
   •m=minutes •es=each session
6. Continuous evaluation using Foreign Language Essential Skills Y=Yes N=No

Symbols:

*to be completed 93
#foreign language distance learning NAU
+in progress
-not indicated
N/A not applicable possibly because it is a transporting district

As shown, six districts (55%) in Apache County chose to teach Spanish and five (45%) chose to teach Navajo. Seven out of eleven districts (64%) chose FLES as the model type, 18% (2/11) chose FLEX, one district chose a Two Way Bilingual Program, and one chose FLES and Partial Immersion. All eleven districts had developed a language plan for implementing elementary foreign language instruction. There was great variation in the length of instruction, ranging from ten minutes to eighty and also in the grades levels taught. Ninety-one percent (10/11) of the districts had committed to conduct an inservice training program for teachers.

Although not all the school districts have sent in a report as required by the Department of Education, approximately 161 of those Arizona school districts that did respond, chose Spanish. Several districts chose Native American languages based on their population: Navajo (8), Pima (2), Apache (1) and Tohono O' odham (1) [a Native American language of the Papago Indians]. Several districts chose a language combination: Spanish/French (1), Spanish/German (1), Spanish/English (1), and Spanish/Russian (1). One district chose just German as the language preference. And finally, at Mesa Public Schools, Spanish was chosen for K-5 and a language potpourri of Spanish, French, German, Latin, Japanese and Russian for grades 6-8.

To demonstrate further what is happening in different districts throughout Arizona, the researcher has chosen to highlight the following school districts: Gilbert, Flagstaff, Tucson, Mohawk, and Osborn.

E. Gilbert Unified School District #41 (Maricopa County)

Gilbert, Arizona, a suburb of Phoenix, is one of the fastest-growing districts in the state (Postero 1993). There are ten elementary schools, where 102 teachers utilize a technology-assisted delivery system to instruct approximately 2,550 students in Spanish following a FLEX (Foreign Language Exploratory) program model.[4] In 1990 the governing board of Gilbert School District approved curriculum to be taught to children in grades 1-6. Support was given to the schools by providing materials and training to teachers through the course of the pilot year and the subsequent two years of

implementation. There were three phases: Phase 1: Identification of existing resources, Spring 1990; Phase II: Pilot, 1990-91; and Phase III: Implementation, 1991-1993. A questionnaire was sent to all teachers in May of 1990 to inform, to elicit input, and to identify talent. Of the 200 responses received, the results showed (Postero, 1993:622):

1. Second language: Spanish, (197).
2. Preferred program delivery model: FLES with itinerant teacher, (183)
3. Teachers who self-rated themselves proficient in reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills as the result of home language or education, or both: (8).

Amigos and *Saludos* (two video programs teaching Spanish) were available through the existing resource of Arizona School Services through Education Technology (ASSET) for the primary and intermediate levels. Using these video programs, a voluntary pilot program was proposed, and during the 1990-1991 school year at least one teacher at each grade level received curriculum materials. Teachers also received professional growth credit for the study of foreign language at the university level and in-house staff development took place during the pilot year with guest speakers from Northern Arizona University. During phase III: implementation 1991-1993, Dr. Manuel Rodríguez of the Modern Language Department at Northern Arizona University received money through the National Endowment for the Humanities to offer teacher training to the many unqualified foreign language teachers in Arizona. Two teachers from the Gilbert District were among the 30 participants who received training in second-language methodologies.

According to the implementation plan of 1992, Gilbert Unified had chosen FLES, not FLEX, as their program model. They had established a plan in conjunction with the high school program and were conducting inservice training on a district-wide basis. They were going to teach Spanish two times a week for 30 minutes, starting at the first grade and then moving up through the grades.

F. Flagstaff Unified School District #1(Coconino County)

According to the implementation plan of 1992, Flagstaff had chosen two models: FLES and Partial Immersion, to conduct Spanish classes twice a week for 20 minutes

starting with grades 1-2. They had not coordinated and articulated the elementary foreign language program yet with the high school, but they had committed to conduct an inservice training program for the teachers on a district-wide basis. The district had also developed a process for continuous evaluation of student proficiency on the Foreign Language Essential Skills.

G. Tucson Unified School District (Pima County)

Tucson, located in the southern part of the state, indicated on its implementation plan sheet of 1992 that it was teaching Spanish on a daily basis starting with first grade and integrating instruction with other subject areas. It chose FLES as its program model, which had been coordinated and articulated with the high school program. The Tucson District developed inservice from within. Attached to the plan sheet was another graphic organizer clarifying their objectives, activities and a time line for completion of the goals.

In 1996, a group of concerned community members and educators created a consortium to organize and improve the quality of foreign language instruction in the elementary schools. The group, known as the Consortium for Quality Second Language Instruction for Kids (CL2), included school districts in Pima County and the City of Tucson Parks and Recreation Department. The CL2 required that any foreign language program or class offered through the schools or parks and recreation include three criteria:

- that all second language classes for kids be taught in the target language.
- that these classes be content based, fun and interesting, contextual, age appropriate, and offer hands-on experiences for children.
- that teachers of second language classes receive training (Overall, 1996-1997).

Most of the members of CL2 taught Spanish classes, which have been named *Español Para Niños*. This consortium then received letters of endorsement from the Arizona State Department of Education and from then President of the Arizona Board of Regents Eddie Basha, who is a strong advocate for second language acquisition by elementary children.

Free training was provided to any person who was interested in learning how to teach a foreign language to children in grades K-12. Continuing Education Units are

available for this teacher training through the University of Arizona for a small fee. The course prepares teachers to "develop interesting age appropriate curriculum including games, songs, puppetry, art, dance, and thematic content-based instruction appropriate for second language acquisition. The course also includes basic information on current linguistic theory in second language acquisition" (Overall, 1996-97:4).

CL2 members worked with the chair of the Language, Reading and Culture Department in the College of Education as well as the dean of the College of Humanities in order to propose CL2 as a community outreach project. The consortium hoped to become a state model for providing excellent foreign language instruction for young children.

Currently, a new group known as the ACL2 (Arizona Council on Second Language Instruction), was initiated from the Arizona Language Association-Foreign Language in the Elementary Schools (AZLA-FLES). The ACL2 was established to provide information about second language instruction including foreign language, English as a second language and bilingual education in order to improve communication, facilitate collaboration and outreach on second language issues. Its purpose is to unite the community, legislators, school board association (ASBA), Native American tribes, universities, language associations, superintendents and second language educators, in order to discuss ways to improve second language instruction in the state of Arizona (Overall, Dec. 1996). As well, the ACL2 with the help of state universities are in the process of developing a program to prepare native speakers as FLES instructors. The native speakers must have a minimum of a high school diploma, be able to pass the Bilingual Education Proficiency Exam, and enroll in 12 units of credit in child development, linguistics, methodology of second language instruction, and a practicum. The child development and linguistics classes may be taken at the community college if they are transferable as university credits (Overall, Sept. 1997).

H. Mohawk Valley School District #17, Roll, AZ, (Yuma County)

The Mohawk District chose both FLEX and FLES as their program models on the 1992 implementation plan sheet. They had not coordinated their program with the high

school because they were an elementary district. However, discussions between the administrators of the closest high school, Antelope Union High School District, had occurred and an agreement had been made to follow the Foreign Language Essential Skills provided by the State Board of Education. Inservice training for staff would be through Northern Arizona University in Yuma. The kindergarten and first grade teachers had previously taken foreign language course work as well as a conversational Spanish class. Instruction would begin in kindergarten and first grade, and expansion would occur in the second and third grade depending on teacher qualifications, availability of funds, curriculum development and program evaluation. The district had not developed a process for continuous evaluation of student proficiency on the Foreign Language Essential Skills but noted in their plan of 1992 that curriculum would be modified in the fall of 1993 and a formal and continuous method of measuring student progress would be developed.

I. Osborn School District #8, Phoenix, Arizona (Maricopa, County)

The Osborn School District comprises five elementary schools in the inner-city of Phoenix. The student population of Osborn includes some 30 different languages, bringing together children from many cultural backgrounds. Interpreters are often brought in to translate for students who speak a language not spoken by personnel at the schools. There is a large Hispanic population as well as Native American, Vietnamese, Asian, Middle East, etc. at the schools. The teachers have ESL and Bilingual endorsements to accommodate the diverse population that they teach. Students are evaluated as much as possible in their native language and then are instructed in English.

On the 1992 implementation plan, the Osborn District chose to incorporate FLEX as their program model after research had been done by a foreign language committee that had studied the foreign language mandate and the program options available to the district. The use of the video program "Amigos," through ASSET, would be used for focused instruction two days a week showing the same lesson twice at 25 minutes per lesson. Then, integrated instruction would be used by placing signs in both English and Spanish in the classrooms, orally naming things in both languages, giving commands, using cognates

(words that are almost the same in English and Spanish) and games and activities. Assessment of the program would be conducted both in an oral and written program evaluation by interviewing grade one teachers both mid-year and at the end of the year. No student testing took place in grade one but the committee would incorporate assessment of oral proficiency to take place by grade 3. Staff development was projected to occur as teachers met and learned about the *Amigos* program and reviewed objectives and vocabulary for first grade. Strategies for integrating Spanish would be introduced into the first grade curriculum. Further sessions would be held to develop language and culture components of the program.

IV. FLES in the Mesa Public Schools

According to the 1992 Elementary Foreign Language Implementation Plan (see Appendix N), MPS chose both FLEX and FLES as their program models. They had coordinated and articulated the elementary foreign language program with the high school program and had committed to conduct inservice training for teachers. Specific methods of district coordination and articulation of the elementary foreign language program with the high school program is unclear because the form only indicated a yes/no response. Spanish was chosen for grades K-5 with a language potpourri of Spanish, French, German, Latin, Japanese, and Russian at grades 6-8. Attached to the plan sheet, a graphic organizer detailed the instructional plan, what support materials were available, and what the student indicators would be for grade levels 1-8. Table 2 depicts what would occur at the third grade level. The support materials were videotaped Spanish lessons that tie the Spanish goals to the core units that are already taught in science and social studies. For example, the students in third grade study animals and their habitats. In the third grade unit called, *Count Down to Earth Spanish Supplement*, students are learning about animals from four habitats: the zoo, the pets, the farm, and the desert.

TABLE 2

Third Grade Elementary Foreign Language Plan for Mesa Public Schools

Third Grade (Pilot 1993-1994- Implementation 1994-1995)*

Instructional Plan	Support Materials	Student Indicators
Spanish will be taught by the regular classroom teacher. Instruction will be at 3 intervals throughout the school year. Each interval will have about 20 hours of instruction.	• Videotaped Spanish materials that tie the Spanish goals to the core units taught in science and social studies. • Evaluation materials • VCR and monitor for every two teachers. • Teacher inservice	• The student counts to 100. • The student gives simple classroom directions. • The student asks and responds to questions. • The student demonstrates understanding of simple sentences. • The student reads simple words.

*Source: Elementary Foreign Language Plan for Mesa Public Schools, June 15, 1992

On February 18, 1997, the Mesa Public Schools Board met and discussed the current status of foreign language at all levels of instruction. A review of the seven year Strategic Curriculum Review of the Foreign Language Plan was presented to the board. The Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum introduced the topic by presenting a preview of foreign language instruction for the district. The following information presents data given during the presentation by the Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and the chair of the Curriculum Review Committee for Foreign Language.

A curriculum review occurs in each major content area every six to seven years. The review consists of persons within the district and outside the district and those who are familiar with the particular content area. The task of the committee is to gather information about Spanish instruction, analyze existing curriculum, look at test scores, expectations, enrollment, and courses taught, and to study current research in the area of second language. Mesa Public Schools had offered foreign language in the district prior to the state mandate through the use of kits that offered foreign language materials already organized for teachers to use in their classrooms. Also, volunteers from the community who were fluent or native speakers helped the teachers who did not speak Spanish or the language taught.

When the mandate was first passed, MPS did several things to meet its demands. They piloted a video program called *Saludos* and later a video program called *Amigos*, which had native speakers interacting with non-native speakers learning Spanish. Later, a foreign language specialist, or resource teacher, was hired in the district. The resource teacher began to create a video program that would meet the needs of teachers who did not speak Spanish in order to teach the concepts like colors, numbers, animals, etc. needed at each grade level.

Instruction at the elementary level was stopped and started several times due to lack of funding, unqualified teachers, and decisions by the Arizona State Board of Education to offer extensions to districts so that pilots, foreign language materials and general acceptance by teachers could be met. The Assistant Superintendent said that in the Fall of 1997, the sixth graders will be the first class in Mesa to have completed six years of foreign language instruction, since they were first graders in 1991-1992. Spanish is taught in conjunction with art, music, movement and other core areas when the teacher is fluent. Components include: basic vocabulary, simple conversation, naming of classroom objects, etc, in Spanish. The Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum clarified to the board that proficiency was not expected, but she expressed a hope that children would develop an interest in foreign language for course decisions later in junior and senior high school. She believes the elementary foreign language program meets the standards set by the State and possibly exceeds the state mandate. A clarification of just how this was accomplished was not given. She recognizes possible areas of improvement but, as always, funding becomes a major issue (Mesa Board Meeting, Feb. 18, 1997).

The chairperson for the foreign language review process discussed the cycle of foreign language as the first subject area to complete the entire review cycle because a plan was in place previous to the current report of the past seven years. In 1989, according to the chairperson, at the secondary level, there were approximately 6,800 students taking foreign language classes in MPS. In February, 1997 there are approximately 9,600 students enrolled in four to six different language courses demonstrating an increase of

35% over the last few years at the secondary level. The chairperson proposes that this shows a stronger value in foreign language among students.

The Mesa Public Schools appointed a committee of parents, teachers and administrators through various Parent/Teacher Organizations, the Mesa Association of School Administrators, and the Mesa Education Association. The committee was facilitated by the chairperson to first review the past foreign language plan in the District. The committee met on October 9, October 23, October 30, November 6, November 20 and December 11, 1996. First, the committee reviewed the Strategic Curriculum Review and Planning Committee Report for Foreign Language, which was presented to the Governing Board in 1991, the implementation of that plan and the development of the program since 1991, and the current status of foreign languages in MPS. Current literature and information regarding foreign language learning, foreign language enrollment, student needs and community input were also reviewed by the committee. The committee found that many of the action items of the previous plan had been completed, that others were of an ongoing nature and that reasonable progress had been made on them throughout the next cycle of the plan. No clarification was given as to which action items had been completed. Secondly, they revised the Mission Statement, Philosophy and Goals of the district with regards to second language instruction (see Appendix M). Next, they prepared an action plan for the next seven years to guide the foreign language department in the district. These actions consisted of items deemed essential to successfully implement the district's mission as well as the foreign language mission, philosophy and goals. It consisted of action items for the overall program, information on technology, the elementary program, and professional development. The committee proposed action that would boost enrollment in foreign language and improve instruction. They recommended several steps for the board to consider in the future. The following were a few of the steps included in the report:

- promoting increased enrollment in languages now offered, especially at Level III and above;
- informing students, counselors, administrators and the community of new college admission recommendations;
- establishing a foreign language technology committee to examine computer programs, CD-ROMs, laser discs, the Internet, video, satellite

access and other suitable options for foreign language instruction; and
•ensuring that all students in grades one through five have access to instruction in a foreign language (Jordan, 1997).

As noted, one of the action steps was to promote enrollment in Level III, which refers to the high school level. The chairperson, the superintendent, and the board were concerned that students were dropping out of foreign language instruction just as they were beginning a more in-depth proficiency of the language. The discussion concluded that because it takes a long time to learn a foreign language and to be able to use it in a content-based manner, instruction was deemed essential at the elementary level. A suggestion was made to hold a study session to analyze foreign language instruction and possible strategies to improve its proficiency, like language camps where whole families would learn together, immersion programs, magnet programming, etc (Mesa Board Meeting, Feb. 18, 1997). And finally, the end remarks were the challenge of funding to hire quality and proficient foreign language teachers, budget, and the lack of trained teachers in general (see Appendix O for specifics on the elementary program).

In conclusion, FLES has a very broad and diverse role in foreign countries, in the United States, in Arizona and in Mesa Public Schools. At the release of the National Standards in Anaheim, California, November, 1995, many speakers emphasized the need for foreign language to be initiated early in the elementary grades and continued through high school and college. Only then will students acquire the necessary language skills and cultural knowledge in order to enable them to function effectively in the multilingual world of the upcoming 21st century. As noted, speaker Jeffrey Munks, founder of the AT&T Language Line, concluded, "as technology continues to bring the people of the world closer together, language looms as the last great barrier keeping them apart...in preparing for global market opportunities, there should be no higher priority for American students than to acquire competence with a second language" (Draper & Scebold, 1996:6).

CHAPTER THREE

I. Data collection

A series of questionnaires was developed by the investigator to gather relevant data for this research project. Separate questionnaires were created for the teachers, the principals, the media specialists, the parent liaison, the two district personnel, and the state official (see Appendices A-F, K). A pilot study was completed in 1996 with the researcher's own principal at Adams Elementary, along with the media specialist and three teachers. After completion of the pilot, changes and adaptations were made to the questionnaires based on principal and teacher input.

During the 1995-1996 school year, there were forty-eight elementary schools in Mesa Public Schools. A number was assigned from one to forty-eight based on alphabetical order. The numbers were drawn randomly and then communication was done by telephone and/or the fax machine until volunteer schools were found. A verbal script was used to explain the purpose of the research and the responsibility of the possible subjects (see Appendix G). Letters of recruitment to the teacher and principal (see Appendices I and J), plus the letter of consent (see Appendix H) were sent to most schools ahead of the initial telephone call to prepare the principal for later communication with the investigator. The researcher continued communication until seven schools agreed to participate in the research. Each school was assigned a letter of the alphabet and each participant was given a number. For example, School A, interviewee 1, was identified as A1 and so on. The principals at six of the seven elementary schools selected teachers to participate. Then, contact with the participants was established and scheduled interviews were completed after each principal had been interviewed. Teachers at School G were recruited through personal contact made by the investigator and then followed the same procedure as the other schools.

The investigator interviewed most of the participants at their prospective schools, although three interviews were completed at their homes. Each interviewee read the letter of consent and gave permission to participate in the study as well as to allow the

investigator to keep the audiotapes for future reference in evaluating the mandate's outcomes in Mesa Public Schools. During the taped interview the investigator took notes on the questionnaire and used the audiotape as a device to obtain additional data. The interview ranged from 15 minutes to approximately 45 minutes depending on the amount of information each participant was willing to share and their educational role. For example, the teachers' interviews were generally longer.

II. Description of sample

The sample population for this study consisted of two people from Mesa Public Schools--the director of Science and Social Sciences and a resource teacher; one state official, the education program specialist, Bilingual Unit, Arizona State Department of Education; seven media specialists; seven elementary principals; twenty-eight teachers and one parent liaison, for a total of N=46 participants.

Based on the demographic information gathered, the following table identifies the gender breakdown of the participants:

TABLE 3

Gender

	Male	Female
Teachers	2	26
Principals	7	0
Media Specialists	1	6
District Personnel	1	1
State Official	1	0
Parent Liaison	0	1
Total	12	34

The teachers' age range was between 32 and 54, with an average age of 43 years. Age range for the principals was from 34 to 56, with an average age of 45. The media specialists ranged from 39 to 63, with an average age of 50. The district personnel age

range was from 46 to 51, with an average age of 49. The age of the one state official was 55, and the parent liaison was 41.

Out of the 28 classroom teachers interviewed, 10 (36%) held either a B.S.or B.A. degree only and 18 of the 28 (64%) held a M.A. degree as well. All seven (100%) principals held M.A. degrees, and one principal held a Ph.D. degree. One of the two district administrators held an M.A. and the other an Ed. D. degree. The state official held a M.A. degree and the parent liaison held a B.A. degree.

Ethnicity for the teachers was divided among three groups: 22 Anglos, 5 Mexican Americans, and 1 Asian American. Five (71%) of the principals were Anglos, one (14%) was Mexican American and one (14%) was Asian American. The seven Media Specialists were all Anglos. The two district personnel were both Anglos, the state official was Mexican American, and the parent liaison was Mexican American.

III. Instrumentation

The questionnaires were written in English and consisted of demographic information with both open-ended and closed-ended questions that related to each participant's role. The teachers' questionnaire was the most extensive, with topics that included seven categories: 1) Language Background Information, 2) Spanish Instruction in the Classroom, 3) Teacher Perceptions of Spanish Instruction, 4) Program Assessment, 5) Teacher Training, 6) Suggestions for the Researcher, and 7) Third Grade Teachers Only (see Appendices A-F, and K for sample questionnaires).

IV. Data analysis

Information gathered from the audio taped interviews served as the primary data source for this research. Each questionnaire contained open and closed-ended items. The closed-ended items were used to tally responses for frequency counts in the form of percentages. The open-ended items gleaned responses from the questionnaire and audio-taped interview to determine what themes or topics evolved. For example, "*Do you think teaching Spanish is important? Why or Why not?*" Data were descriptive and qualitative in

nature and the author provided direct quotes from the subjects where necessary to serve as a direct source of information.

The secondary source of information were the results from the 1995 Spanish Test given to the majority of third graders across the Mesa Public Schools District. Prior to the implementation of the third grade test, teachers were not held accountable or responsible for how much Spanish was taught or how much time was spent on foreign language instruction. The test has not only encouraged emphasis on more in-depth instruction in the third grade but it has also placed a greater responsibility on first and second grade teachers to teach Spanish in the lower grades so as to impact acquisition and instruction in the higher grades.

CHAPTER FOUR

This chapter sets out to answer the seven research questions and hypotheses presented in Chapter One. The sample consisted primarily of classroom teachers, media specialists, and principals. Research question #1 was answered by data gleaned from the twenty-eight teachers who were teaching during the 1995-1996 school year. Research questions #2, #3, and #4 were answered by both teachers and principals in the district. Research question #5 was responded to by teachers and media specialists. Research question #6 was answered by teachers. Research questions #3 and #6 also included data from the resource teacher and the director of Science and Social Sciences. And finally, research question #7 was addressed by teachers, principals and media specialists.

1. Research question #1:

What kinds of preparation (foreign language classes, methodology, study and travel abroad, workshops and inservices, etc.) have teachers had to enhance foreign language instruction and what types of training and instructional support are preferred?

According to Heining-Boynton (1990), there are many recurring themes in the FLES programs of the fifties and sixties that are still evident today. Although every school district is not the same, she found six reasons for the decline of these programs that schools across the nation could use as a checklist when planning for a productive program in foreign language instruction. Beyond the usual issues of money, changes in curricular priorities and a dislike for that which is foreign, six reasons for the disappearance of FLES exist: They are: "1) lack of qualified teachers; 2)unrealistic and/or inappropriate goals and objectives; 3) incompatible pedagogy; 4) lack of articulation; 5)lack of homework, grades, and evaluation; and 6) lack of parent support" (504).

One of the primary reasons that MPS developed its Spanish video program was the lack of qualified second language teachers in the elementary schools. The mandate from the state that school districts across Arizona were to incorporate the study of foreign language in the elementary schools, although established over several years, came very

suddenly to unprepared teachers and administrators. Rosenbusch (1991) discusses the importance of teacher preparation and the skills that a teacher needs to acquire in order to be a successful language teacher. A teacher should be competent in all areas of general education, interpersonal skills, professional education, skill in the language, understanding of developmental levels of children, classroom management skills, knowledge of content-area curriculum, and specialized training in reading and writing for students who are developing literacy skills in their first language. Curtain & Pesola (1994), using priorities summarized by Met (1987), identify several priorities for teacher background and skills.

> The effective elementary school foreign language teacher has been prepared to do the following:
>
> 1. Understand and like children
> 2. Be skilled in the management of the elementary school classroom
>   - •Create an affective and physical environment in which learning happens
>   - •Understand and apply the research on school and teacher effectiveness
> 3. Know the elementary school curriculum
>   - •Approach instruction from a holistic, integrated, content-based perspective
>   - •Select and sequence activities that are appropriate to the developmental needs of the child
> 4. Teach second-language reading and writing to learners who are developing first-language literacy skills, so that the foreign language program can build on these skills rather than fighting with what is going on in the first-language curriculum
> 5. Understand the precepts of communicative language teaching and draw from a repertoire of strategies to implement these precepts
> 6. Use the target language fluently, with a high degree of cultural appropriateness
> 7. Draw on an excellent understanding of the target culture, especially as it relates to children, including children's literature (Curtain & Pesola, 1994:243-244).

Rosenbusch (1991) proposes that no program can function without well-prepared and qualified teachers. One of the best ways school districts can prepare teachers is by requesting that the state department of education establish certification standards for elementary school foreign language teachers and by providing them the necessary training through colleges and universities. The Certification Unit for the Arizona Department of Education has given teachers three distinct options in order to receive an Elementary Foreign Language Endorsement for grades K-8. These requirements are described in Appendix Q. Rosenbusch (1991) states:

> When no state certification standard exists for the preparation of elementary school foreign language teachers, there are no guidelines by which universities can develop a teacher certification program. Without these guidelines, and with no pressure from the local school districts or the state department of education, the universities will have little motivation to develop programs for the certification of elementary school foreign language teachers (306).

How well-prepared were the twenty-eight Mesa teachers interviewed across the seven schools? They were asked the following question: *"Since the passage of the mandate have you taken any steps to enhance your foreign language skills?"*, sixteen (57%) replied in the affirmative. Twelve (43%) responded in the negative. Then each teacher was asked to identify the specific type of training with the following question: *"What type of training have you had to assist you in teaching Spanish?"* The teachers described their training with the following responses:

TABLE 4

Types of training to assist in Spanish instruction

Options	N=28
Spanish Language Classes	50%
None	32%
Other training or experiences	29%
Workshops	25%
Travel abroad	14%
Residence in another country	4%

The "Other training or experiences" were: using Spanish at home, friendships with Hispanics, talking with spouse, personal study, teaching English to Hispanic adults, books and tapes, district Spanish video tapes and family communication.

As noted, many teachers had not taken any steps or received training to assist them in the instruction of Spanish. The researcher asked them to discuss what had prohibited them from taking more classes or receiving training: *"What has stopped you from taking classes?"* The number one reason chosen by 20 out of 28 teachers was that of time, meaning personal (71%). Other responses were money (25%); availability of classes from

the district (14%); interest (14%); other (14%); Not accountable to anyone (4%), and language level of class (too high/low) (4%). Four teachers claimed the following responses under the category of "Other": Informant B3 said that none of the reasons applied to her so she enrolled in a class; D6 said that she was still taking classes; F3 said she was working on her masters; and F4 said the feedback from the other teachers was that taking a Spanish language class was a waste of time.

Even though time is an issue, training is an expected outcome for many of the Mesa teachers. The following question addresses their preferences: *"If you could receive instructional support from the district and/or state, what would you elect regarding the instruction of Spanish at your school? Please rank your answers starting with one being the most important"*. Teachers were asked to rank (1 being the most important and 5 being the least important) the following choices: school-wide training from the district, (SWT); attendance at workshops and/or classes, (AWC); additional teaching materials, (ATM); allocated budget for the purchase of Spanish materials, (AB); and Other (O). Teachers ranked the following as their number one choice: AWC=25%, SWT= 21%, O=14%, ATM=11%, AB=7%. See table 5 for the rankings by selections.

TABLE 5

Teachers' choice of instructional support

Instructional Support	N=28				
Ranking	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5
Attendance at workshops/classes	25%	25%	18%	7%	0%
School-wide training	21%	29%	7%	18%	0%
Other	14%	0%	0%	0%	11%
Additional teaching materials	11%	7%	21%	25%	7%
Allocated budget for materials	7%	14%	25%	21%	0%

We can glean from these data that teachers felt attendance at workshops and/or classes and school-wide training were more important than receiving additional teaching materials or an allocated budget for materials. However, the purchase of materials with a

budget did come in strong for a third and fourth choice. For those teachers who chose "Other", their responses included: specialized teacher, fluent Spanish instructor, trained personnel, resource person, site-based personnel and allocated tuition from the district for a substitute so teachers could take classes.

Therefore, we have established that teachers want to receive more training through classes and school but what type of specific training is preferred? The following question was asked: *"If you could receive instructional support from the district and/or state, what would you elect regarding the instruction of Spanish at your school? Please rank your answers starting with one being the most important."* Teachers were asked to rank the following types of training: teaching methods (TPR, NA, Suggestopedia, etc.), grammar and pronunciation, theories of language learning, curriculum design, games and songs, drill and practice techniques, and other choices. The following table explains their selections:

TABLE 6

Specific type of training requested by teachers

Types of training	N=28						
	Ranking #1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7
Grammar/pronunciation	29%	21%	18%	7%	11%	14%	0%
Teaching methods	25%	11%	11%	21%	11%	7%	4%
Games and songs	14%	17%	18%	21%	11%	4%	0%
Curriculum design	7%	14%	11%	18%	29%	0%	0%
Other	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%
Drill/practice techniques	4%	25%	32%	11%	7%	7%	0%
Theories/language learning	0%	14%	4%	7%	11%	43%	0%

Eight teachers (29%) chose grammar and pronunciation as their number one choice of training. And as their second choice for training, teaching methods of Spanish were important, with games and songs as their third choice. Interestingly, drill and practice techniques as well as theories of language learning were ranked sixth and seventh respectively.

The program specialist, bilingual unit, at the Arizona Department of Education, was asked "*If you could reimplement the Arizona Mandate in the elementary schools, what changes would you propose?*" The necessity of teacher development was an essential step. The changes proposed were: 1) funding for training, 2) training of teachers, 3) classes with different levels based on language proficiency, 4) instructional materials, and 5) workshops for teachers that would be ongoing (Personal interview, March, 1996).

In conclusion, hypothesis #1 was partially correct, as it stated that some teachers would have prepared for foreign language instruction by taking classes through the district and through colleges and universities. As shown by the data, fourteen (50%) of the teachers had taken Spanish classes, which was a higher percentage than anticipated. With reference to the type of training preferred by the teachers for further enhancement of their foreign language skills, the researcher was surprised to note that grammar and pronunciation (29%) was the number one choice for training. And as expected, teaching methods was ranked next by seven teachers (25%) as a preferred type of training. Games and songs (14%) was an important choice, but it was ranked third. Also true to hypothesis #1 was the low percentage of teachers who chose theories of language learning because 0% of the teachers selected it as their first choice and 43% selected it as their sixth choice in order of importance out of seven options. Teachers want to take classes to enhance their foreign language skills, but the factor of time as noted by 71% of the teachers was their number one reason for not taking classes. A possible solution to this would be on-site training with substitutes to cover classes and the development of district-based curricula that would offer teachers preparation in the areas of grammar and pronunciation, teaching methods and games and songs.

II. Research question #2:

What are the perceptions of teachers and principals towards Spanish instruction with regards to receptiveness and motivation?

Each teacher interviewed was asked how receptive to the teaching of Spanish the following five groups were: 1) you as the individual teacher, 2) your colleagues, 3) your

school, 4) your parents, and 5) your community. Each teacher rated these five groups on a scale from 1 being the lowest to 5 the highest. Ratings were tabulated based on the sample of twenty-eight teachers and averaged per school. The colleagues' group refers to all teachers at the school. The community was a separate entity from the parents referring to everyone involved in an area surrounding a school. The parents have reference to those closely tied to a school through their children. The following table identifies the receptive nature of the five groups according to the perception of the teacher interviewed.

TABLE 7

Teacher rating of receptiveness towards the instruction of Spanish

Groups	School (N=7)	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	Average
•Yourself		3.3	5	4	3.3	4.2	4.5	4.8	4.2
•Colleagues		2.3	3.5	2.3	3.5	2.7	4.3	3.6	3.2
•School		2.6	3.3	3.3	3	3.3	4.3	3.3	3.3
•Parents		2.3	3.8	3.3	4	3.3	4.5	3.6	3.5
•Community		2.3	3.8	3.8	3.6	3.1	4.3	3.6	3.5
Number of teachers per school		3	4	4	4	5	4	4	Total= 28

As shown by the preceding table, the average receptiveness towards teaching Spanish was highest (4.2) for the individual teacher and lowest for their colleagues (3.2). Parents and community had the same rating (3.5) and the school (3.3) fell in the middle.

The principals were asked a similar question: *What are the perceptions of the following groups toward the instruction of Spanish? Teachers? Students? Parents? Community* ?" The following table demonstrates their views.

TABLE 8

PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS TOWARDS THE INSTRUCTION OF SPANISH

	Principals at Schools A-G N=7
Principal A	T=unfunded mandate; S=novelty; P=academic concern; C=one more thing.
Principal B	T=positive; S=excited, motivated, willing to participate; P=n/a, C=n/a.
Principal C	T=need to do it because it's been mandated; S=open to it, it's a break from daily routine, relaxed setting; P=it's not a basic skill so why teach it; C=yes, let's do it for the Mexican American heritage that is present.
Principal D	T=positive and something we need to do; S=same response; P=same response; C=mainly positive with very few who feel it's a waste of time.
Principal E	T=85%-90% for it; S=positive attitude; P=quietly happy with some vocal disgruntled parents; C=content with decision.
Principal F	T=bogged down by practical roadblocks but are supportive philosophically; S=Take it for granted; P=supportive, very few negative comments; C=supportive.
Principal G	T=want to be trained; S=younger better than Jr. High; P=proximity to Mexico; C=high need.

Key: "T"= teachers; "S"= students; "P" = parents; "C" = community and n/a=not applicable.

The seven principals revealed positive, negative, neutral, and mixed perceptions towards the instruction of Spanish at their school due to the mandate. Further research to support their perceptions would need to occur with each group in order to verify the validity of these comments. However, it does show that the principals believe that the instruction of Spanish for the groups is generally positive among the students; the teachers want to be trained but feel that there are practical "roadblocks" such as funding and training; parents are concerned and need more proof of its validity; and the community varies, with some who see it as a logical choice because of our location and culture, while others see it as "one more thing" that has to be taught.

The teachers were asked the following question relating to their level of motivation: *"What motivates you to use Spanish in the classroom? Rank your answers in order of*

importance with 1 being the most motivational" (8 least motivational). There were eight options that the teachers could choose from: 1) it's a state mandate, 2) district influence, 3) it's part of the curriculum,4) large Hispanic population, 5) school focus, 6) colleagues, 7) personal interest, and 8) other. Motivator #5, school focus, refers to the emphasis that schools place on certain subject areas during a given year. For example, at the researcher's own school, it has chosen to strengthen its emphasis on math during the 1997-1998 school year. In previous years, the focus was to improve writing skills. Table 9 shows the ranking of answers by the twenty-seven teachers.[5] The number under each rank represents how many times the teacher chose the option as the number one, two, three, etc. motivator for using Spanish in the classroom. Some teachers did not use all the options as motivators as shown by the rank total .

TABLE 9

Motivation for teachers to use Spanish in the classroom

Options	Rank 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	T
Large Hispanic population	6	5	3	4	2	3	3	0	26
Personal interest	6	5	4	5	2	2	1	0	25
It's part of the curriculum	5	6	4	6	2	1	0	0	24
State mandate	4	1	7	4	2	2	6	0	26
District influence	3	7	5	4	3	4	0	0	26
Other	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4
School focus	1	1	3	4	7	4	4	0	24
Colleagues	0	1	2	1	5	2	4	2	17

N=27
Key: T=total responding teachers

This table illustrates that more teachers chose the large Hispanic population that exists in some of the school boundaries and their personal interest as their most motivational factors in using Spanish in the classroom. Teachers also felt that Spanish was part of the curriculum as is reading, writing, mathematics, etc. Interestingly, the state

mandate was not as strong a factor and even less was district influence. School focus and colleagues ranked at the bottom as motivators. However, if one were to look at the first four rankings for all eight options and tally the total number of teachers who made their selections, and then identify the top four options, certain patterns emerge. We would see that the fact that Spanish is now part of the curriculum (21 votes) has caused a heightened personal interest (20 votes) due to the district influence (19 votes) and the fact that there is a large Hispanic population (18 votes) in Mesa at some of the schools. And, even though only four teachers selected the state mandate as the most motivational, sixteen teachers (across rankings 1-4) felt it did have an impact as one of five most influential options for using Spanish.

In conclusion, the data supports hypothesis #2, which proposed an average rating of at least a "3" towards Spanish instruction with regards to receptiveness by school personnel, parents and community as viewed by the teachers. The average for all groups as perceived by the teachers themselves ranged from 3.2 to 4.2. The teachers (4.2 average) received a higher receptability towards Spanish instruction than any other group, with their colleagues (3.2 average) rating the lowest. Perhaps this is a logical response because teachers are more familiar with their own teaching abilities and not necessarily the skills of their colleagues.

Regarding principals' perceptions towards Spanish instruction, responses were varied: mainly positive, but some neutral and negative comments were also given. In the principals' opinion, students would have more positive responses towards Spanish instruction than teachers, parents and community. This could be due to the novelty of a foreign language and the fact that this has been a new curriculum area for many students over the last seven years. Negativity towards Spanish instruction, as viewed by the principals, was exhibited by parents first, teachers next, followed by the community and lastly the students. More public relations effort needs to occur between the school and the community to alleviate some of the concern. And, perhaps by using native speakers as resources from the community to assist in Spanish instruction, as proposed by the ACL2, would soften teacher frustration and link Spanish instruction as a continual mode of

instruction in the elementary classes. Teachers were most motivated by the large Hispanic population and personal interest and least motivated by focus from the school and colleagues. Perhaps with more training from the district and/or state, the teachers would be more motivated, because Spanish would be supported individually and collectively across grade levels and schools.

11. Research question #3:

What curricular changes have occurred in Mesa Public schools since the passage of the foreign language mandate?

When interviewing the principal at School D, a discussion focused on a comparison of instruction in Spanish before the mandate and after the mandate even though the principal had been at two different schools. Principal D said:

> Before the mandate there's a little bit of foreign language being taught, some Spanish, some French, whatever a teacher happened to know and felt comfortable with and wanted to do in the classroom. It was not part of the curriculum. It was something a teacher enriched the room with because she had the skills. Then, when the mandate came, the district then developed the program which is done mainly through television and our school pretty much does what the district asks us to do. Also, here because we have a lot of students that don't speak English and Spanish is their primary language, we do lots of English as a Second Language (ESL). We also have a fairly extensive program in grades K-4 in which we are teaching some of our students Spanish as part of our program. We have what we call LEP (Limited English Proficient) classes. They are made up of half English and half Spanish speakers. The goal is to teach both groups both languages. So we are doing that in grades K-4. Our first goal really is to make sure that all kids speak English but we would like our English speakers to learn some conversational Spanish somewhere along the way. So we put our at- or above-grade level kids in there. It's a challenge for them and something they can extend themselves and stretch themselves. Plus, all the teachers in the primary grades do what is required or whatever grades is required now through the television. They do whatever the district requires them to do.
>
> (Personal interview, April 1996)

Therefore, after this segment of the interview, the researcher asked if this demonstrated a change in Spanish instruction. The response was in the affirmative. This is just one example of how the mandate has had its effect on the schools in Mesa.

Due to the low number of qualified elementary foreign language teachers in the district, a resource teacher was hired in order to develop a video program to assist those non-Spanish teachers in the classroom. Inside the cover of the third grade unit called *Count Down Spanish Supplement*, is the following suggestion from the Science/Social Science Resource Center to the individual teachers:

> We understand that a teacher being asked to teach Spanish for the first time may not feel comfortable. If you are in this situation, please do not feel that you have to present the lessons. At least for the first year, and maybe the second or third, we only ask that you schedule one half hour each week to show the video. Please use this time to allow the video teacher to teach your class. We hope that this will help you become acquainted with the material and comfortable presenting Spanish lessons in the future (Count Down Spanish Supplement, 1994).

This unit, created by the resource teacher and Educational TV, consisted of approximately 10 lessons. Included with the unit were 100 flash cards that provided either a word (*lunes*-Monday), a picture of an object (*perro*-dog) or a scene (*primavera*-Spring). Also, there were nine transparencies to use along with the student booklet, which began only in third grade. Previously in first and second grade, the lessons were mostly done orally without written responses. A video program was first developed for the first grade teachers, since they were the first ones to use it because the mandate required instruction initiation at that level. Since then, video programs have been developed for the first, second and third grade. The project was begun in fourth grade but never completed. The units were also developed around science or social study themes already used in the classroom by the regular education teacher. For example, a unit called *Animals In Our World* was developed for first grade instruction to introduce students to another language. Students were taught words for fifteen animals, five colors, the numbers 1-10, and a few simple greetings. Teaching about animals, colors and numbers is part of normal first grade instruction, so the students were reinforcing content instruction while learning Spanish. Instructions for using the video tape for instruction were given at the beginning of the Spanish language supplement for teachers. The following suggestion was offered:

> The video tape lessons contained in this kit are designed to teach children in the first grade. Success of teaching language depends on repetition of the same content in an accurate and predictable format of presentation. The

> more identical each sample of language is modeled the quicker children can develop security in their effort to master auditory and verbal skills. For this reason a video tape was selected as the mode of instruction. Each lesson can be played several times and each time the children will see and hear the same content in the same way (Animals In Our World, 1992).

The twenty-eight teachers were asked to give an evaluation of the district program created by the resource teacher and Educational TV. Each teacher responded to the video tape that was designed for their particular grade level. At this time, first through third grade teachers each had a specific video for their grade level. Intermediate fourth through sixth grade teachers could choose among a unit called *Finding Out* , which was a more advanced unit used optionally in third grade, another video-based program, or their own expertise. Therefore, not all of the teachers used the district program. The evaluation that follows reflects the district program as a whole entity and does not reflect individual programs by grade levels. Of those teachers using the district program, twenty-one (75%) had used it to teach or enhance language instruction in the classroom. The other seven teachers (25%) used programs such as *Amigos* or *Saludos* or their own expertise to teach Spanish. Each teacher was asked to rate the district Spanish video programs' successes in teaching Spanish on a scale of 1 being the lowest to 5 being the highest. The average score for the twenty-one evaluators was 3.1. Teachers were also asked to explain their rating. The following rating averages and comments were noted:

TABLE 10

District Spanish program evaluation

School	Total=21 teachers

School A= Rating Average of 4.
(N=3)
Comments: needs more visual material; vocabulary is difficult, videos were improved over time with more pictures, songs, and repetition; the teacher on the video is very personable with the children.

School B=Rating Average of 2.
(N=2)
Comments: found program to be boring which motivated her to use *Amigos;* one tends to lose interest in the tape, real life pictures of animals would be more motivating (an actual cow instead of a drawing).

School C=Rating Average of 4.
(N=4)
Comments: program would be better with visual assistance; offers basic Spanish; instructor not dynamic; very sequential, pacing appropriate, presentation is clear, delivery is consistent but instructor's demeanor is unusual.

School D=Rating Average of 3.
(N=4)
Comments: boring presentation, it would be more inviting with more characters; appears artificial and there are quality bilingual people in the district with a better accent; some students thought it was silly, others were attentive, suggest having a Hispanic to do the tape; improvement over past editions; but later on students did not participate as much; loved the music,

School E=Rating Average of 3.
(N=3)
Comments: video offered basic knowledge, an advantage would be to have a native speaker teach, too much lag time; retained knowledge, video covers a lot of ground, too much; should be a total immersion program, mispronunciation of words, grammatically incorrect.

School F=Rating Average of 2.
(N=3)
Comments: good improvement over first edition but needs more student participation, would be better with a native, too much listening; was blah, not natural, doesn't flow; didn't build on what was taught in 1st grade to 2nd, needs to be more explicit and direct.

School G=Rating Average of 4.
(N=2)
Comments: organized well on the assessment, simple to understand; too much repetition, repeats 5-10 times so the children begin to squirm.

The diversity of ratings and comments are a mixture of positive and negative remarks. Three schools gave the district Spanish program a high rating of (4). Two schools gave an average rating of (3). And two schools gave a low rating of (2). No one gave an exceptionally high (5) rating. Therefore, five (71%) of the schools gave a low to average rating. Some teachers liked the repetition in the program, others found it unnecessary. Some were complementary to the resource teacher's presentation, while others felt a native speaker would be more appropriate. Some felt the program was very basic and others felt it was too difficult. Responses such as these vary, partially due to the teachers' background with foreign language and use of the programs such as *Amigos* and *Saludos*. Two teachers thought that a combination of *Amigos* and the district program would be beneficial. The researcher supports this combination because it gives a wider variety of experiences and uses a storyline to teach Spanish.

Eleven (39%) said they had used other video programs to teach Spanish. When asked whether they would prefer the district Spanish program or another type of program, four (14%) chose the district program, three (11%) chose *Amigos*, two (7%) chose *Saludos*, two (7%) chose a combination of *Amigos* and the district, two (7%) preferred a full-time specialist, two (7%) had only used the district's program and had nothing to compare it to. The others preferred the following: 1- (4%) a lower level program, 1- (4%) one that is hands-on, 1- (4%) another professional one to peak children's interest such as a multimedia program, and finally; 1- (4%) said another program but not *Amigos* because it was too difficult.

Teachers were also asked to describe their students' feelings toward the district program. They had the following descriptors and percentages :

•like it= (36%) •boring= (29%) •fun= (25%)

• other= (18%): too much repetition, liked *Amigos*, some students weren't interested, silly, get excited, novel idea, thought presentation was difficult,

•interesting= (11%) • can't wait to see it= (3%).

Next, teachers were asked to add to or delete from the district program so it would fit their perception of what a Spanish video program should be like. They were given the following choices as shown in the table below:

TABLE 11

Creation of Spanish video program by teachers

Program changes	N=28	
	Less	More
Songs	11%	32%
Vocabulary	7%	25%
Spanish phrases	4%	25%
Cultural Information	4%	12%

Teachers felt that the addition of more songs to teach Spanish (32%) was the best way to create a better program; however, 11% of the teachers felt fewer songs were needed. Cultural information appears to be the least needed change in the program. However, when culture was looked at as a separate issue, a high percentage of teachers felt it was important. Twenty-six (93%) responded positively to the following question: *"Do you think that cultural information should be a part of the District Spanish Program?"* One teacher made no reference to the importance of culture because of their departmentalized program and the other felt that cultural instruction could be woven into the social studies units instead.

What improvements would the resource teacher--whose purpose was to bring language education to children in grades 1-4--personally add if given the opportunity to do so? During the interview (Jan. 1996), the resource teacher proposed three changes. One of the first changes to the video programs would be the addition of more songs. In the first unit completed for first graders, called *Animals In our World*, there was only one song. As each unit was evaluated by the individual classroom teacher, this suggestion became a reality as each unit thereafter implemented the use of more songs and music. The last unit

had a song approximately every five minutes, creating a total of about 27 songs throughout the course of several lessons comprising an entire unit.

Secondly, a change needed to occur in the third grade unit called *Count Down To Earth* , so named because it was "counting down" or reviewing all the Spanish taught in first through third grade. In this unit Spanish was reviewed based on what was taught and used in the previous units in first and second grade. This third grade unit was made prior to the completion of the units for second grade. Therefore, students were reviewing information on animals from the desert in third grade that they had not achieved in second grade. Consequently, the unit *Desert Animals* has not been completed for second graders and teachers in the third grade would be responsible for instruction of curriculum not initiated previously. This is a problem because the error was not made known to the third grade teachers. They have made the assumption that the second grade students entering the next grade have already been taught all the animals when they haven't.

Thirdly, the resource teacher would have liked to refilm some of the lessons to correct errors in colors, length of lessons and general mistakes such as putting a picture of the season "spring" when it should have been "summer" etc. Lesson length was sometimes over 15 minutes and this was too long for younger children. However, the resource teacher was pleased with the progress made with the units over the years and throughout each grade level.

Many teachers added comments as to what other program changes they would deem necessary to improve their version of a Spanish video program. The following table identifies responses by school:

TABLE 12

Other changes in the creation of a Spanish video program by teachers

School A=written hand-out of words for the songs, shortened songs, change format of book, pronunciation improvement, add other teachers to the cast of characters.
School B= add games, sophisticated worksheets, captions for songs on the video, vocabulary cards, worksheets, use of native Spanish speakers, need a variety of characters, real-life situation.
School C=real world would be better than the studio presentation, words for songs, break-up words for songs in phrases, song booklets with words, live actions and objects, shorter songs because they drag on.
School D=more entertaining, give more of a variety of songs, use children talking, real-life situation with children.
School E=use a scope and sequence, don't break down the words by syllables (pá-ja-ro), more fluent speaker with better pronunciation, close to life, words in context, not a good sequence of vocabulary, more flow through the curriculum.
School F=more repetition in a fun way, use a question/answer format for modeling, add humor, visual clues, real-life examples of a dog or banana instead of pictures, introduce less material, cover more in depth, children speaking, incorporate story format like *Amigos*.
School G=too primary for third grade, they would laugh at it; slow moving, cut down on repetition, shorter lessons like 15 minutes or less, visual aids were good.

It can be noted that five of the schools referred to making the program more realistic by using actual or live objects. Four of the schools wanted additional characters added to the program, such as teachers and children. Three schools felt that the pronunciation used by the program specialist needed improvement on the tape or preferred the skill of a native speaker.

Although many curricular changes were deemed necessary in the program, one might question the teachers' desire to continue Spanish instruction . However, when the teachers were asked in the interview process the following question: *"If there had been no mandate and you had the choice, to teach Spanish or not, what would you have chosen and why?"*, twenty-two (79%) of the teachers opted to continue teaching Spanish and only six (21%) replied that they would not. Comments for the continual teaching of

Spanish included: personal interest, the cultural aspect of Arizona, they had previously taught Spanish, it would improve appreciation later in junior high, Southwest theme, children need exposure to foreign languages, presence of a Hispanic population, best method to begin in the elementary grades, it's valuable to children, important because it's the best age, meets bilingual needs; and finally, there are more and more LEP students so it's a benefit to both students.

When asked to explain their "no" responses, the following comments were noted:

- A3, "*other priorities within the curriculum,*"
- C4, "*I would still be using Spanish to get concepts across,* (for example, math) *but I would not be teaching it*" (to the entire class),
- C5, "*background in French,*"
- D4 , "*we don't have the curriculum to teach it,*"
- E5 , "*heavy 2nd grade curriculum, minimal resources,*"
- E7, "*I don't want to learn Spanish.*" (referring to the teacher)

Therefore, we learn that if there hadn't been a mandate, teachers would still be volunteering to teach Spanish at their grade levels. It appears that the negative responses are curriculum-based with the exception that E7 does not "want to learn Spanish." Informant C5 said he would not teach Spanish because of his "background in French." Would it have been better to allow the teachers to choose their own language choice based on their personal background? The teachers were asked the following question: "*If there had been an option to teach another foreign language, what language would you have preferred? French, German, Japanese, or Other.*" The following table identifies their language preference.

TABLE 13

Language choice for instruction if given the option

Language	N=28
•French	21%
•German	11%
•Japanese	4%
•Other	
Italian	4%
Dutch	4%
Spanish	54%

Spanish was still chosen by fifteen of the teachers, with French being the next most popular choice of language. These data correspond with information gathered in the 1980s. The Center for Language Education and Research (CLEAR), with financial support from the U.S. Department of Education, designed a national survey in order to document progress of foreign language programs during the late 1980s. Rhodes & Oxford (1988) discovered that Spanish was the foreign language most commonly taught by 68% of the elementary schools, followed by French (41%), Latin (12%), German (10%), Hebrew (6%), Chinese (3%), Russian (2%), and Spanish for native Spanish speakers, Greek, and various American Indian languages each at 1%.

Spanish was chosen by the Mesa Public Schools District to be the language taught in the elementary grades. The director of Science and Social Sciences for MPS states:

> ...Spanish would be the language. It was based on the language for which we had the highest population. We felt that there were more students who could gain a positive self-image by acknowledging that their language was appropriate than any other. We just felt that if you live in the Southwest, Spanish was the obvious decision. Having made that decision that we wanted to use this as an opportunity to build the self-esteem of our Hispanic population and to help our own students be more conversant with their Spanish neighbors (Personal interview, March 1996).

According to Met (1990), French and Spanish are the predominate languages taught in both elementary and secondary language programs. Met explains:

> No single language is the "best" language for children to learn. Low enrollments in languages other than French and Spanish may mean that future needs of our country and society may not be met, even if foreign language enrollments increase substantially. Because the less commonly

> taught languages are more difficult for English speakers to learn, we should introduce them at a time when learners are receptive to the challenge of language learning and when their ability to master pronunciation of other languages is at its peak (439-40).

In the late 1980's a district survey to verify previous educational experience with a foreign language and teachers' ability to speak the language was sent out to educators of MPS. According to this information, more teachers spoke Spanish than any other language but the percentage district-wide was very low. In an interview in March of 1996 with the director of the Science and Social Sciences Department for MPS, the following explanation was elicited about the survey:

> We did a survey of all elementary teachers to try and determine how many of them had two years of high school Spanish which really is not enough to teach a language. The university would be appalled to send someone who had two years. I had two years of high school French. It would be ludicrous to assume that after 20 years I would be able to lapse back into that and teach French to young kids without a great deal of help. So we acknowledged that when we were trying to get the poll of who had two years of high school Spanish or more in terms of native speakers or more than two years of college experience or whatever, we knew that was incredibly minimal and yet we ended up with less than 10% of our elementary teachers who had two years. So we looked at it and said we are in serious trouble here. We had less than 10% of the people who are expected to teach this who even have the most modest modicum of preparation...We had to find a program with no funding that could somehow or another be taught when the majority of teachers did not have the knowledge (Personal interview, March 1996).

Researchers confirm that one of the most controversial preparatory steps in starting a foreign language program is to identify which language will be taught. A steering committee should consider the following choices before making the final decision: "teacher availability, program organization and scheduling, maintenance of established upper level language programs, and language diversity" (Rosenbusch, 1995b:2). Curtain & Pesola (1994) propose "compelling rationale can be developed for *any* of the commonly taught languages, and any language well taught can provide children with the benefits of global awareness, enhanced basic skills, identification with other cultures, self-esteem, and communicative language skills" (265). When only one language is chosen , this may have a possible adverse effect on the enrollments in other languages at the upper grade

levels. And if more than one language has been implemented at the elementary level, it may weaken the district's program and make it difficult to articulate the languages with the middle and high schools. There is a possibility that elementary students will choose the language they were previously taught for the middle and high school grades which might decrease enrollment in other languages. Curtain & Pesola (1994) suggest, "in many districts, however, all languages have benefited from an increased interest in learning languages, and students entering high school choose to add a second foreign language, or to explore a different language" (264).

How has the mandate affected the amount of time devoted to Spanish instruction in the primary grades? The teachers were asked, "*How often do you teach Spanish during the week?*" Diverse responses were received from the twenty-eight teachers. Seven (25%) of the teachers use Spanish once during the week. Four (14%) teach twice a week. Informant A4 teaches Spanish daily for eight weeks. Informants D5, D6, E6, F6, and G3 integrate the instruction with other core subject areas. A3 teaches Spanish for nine weeks during the first semester of school. B5 teaches Spanish for one hour during the fourth quarter. B1 teaches Spanish with thematic units and D3 does the same, along with holiday activities. C-3 teaches Spanish three times a week during second semester. C6 teaches twice a week, once for 45 minutes and then the second time for 20 minutes. D4 teaches for five weeks, two to four times a week.

The number of minutes of Spanish instruction also reflects a wide range of choices: from five to ten minutes up to one hour. According to Met (1990:438-39) "foreign language instruction should be scheduled daily, and for no less than 30 minutes." Met is referring to FLES programs that have been implemented through the elementary grades and articulated with the high school. According to the MPS Curriculum Guide, third graders are to receive a minimum of 60 minutes per week. Rosenbusch (1995b) states that "the minimum amount of time recommended for an elementary school foreign language class is 75 minutes per week, with classes meeting at least every other day."

Curtain & Pesola (1994) suggest that for optimal learning to take place, "FLES programs should meet for a minimum of twenty to thirty minutes per day, five days per

week, with as much additional reinforcement of the language throughout the school day as possible" (266). In Canada, students receive forty minutes per day of French instruction. If language programs do not meet on a daily basis, teachers and students must spend time reviewing the lesson to compensate for the long time in between instruction. Each school district must decide how to accommodate the need for foreign language instruction either by allotting some of the time to be taken from language arts or social studies or academic time from each of the core areas. Another option would be to plan a content-related curriculum that correlates with the basic curriculum, demonstrating that objectives would be met in the foreign language (Curtain & Pesola, 1994).

In conclusion, since the passage of the mandate, the curriculum avenues have dramatically changed in Mesa Public Schools. Just as national efforts in testing are increasing, modifying, and regrouping, so will the evaluation of Spanish instruction at the elementary schools in Arizona. As stated in hypothesis #4, MPS has created a workable plan for teaching Spanish that will continue to be used whether Spanish instruction is mandated or not. However, the researcher has learned that great improvement in the district's video program is necessary if continual use by the teachers is to occur. The average score given for the district Spanish program by twenty-one evaluators was a 3.1. reflecting a mid-range evaluation. Teacher comments appear to be more negative than positive. Only four (14%) of the teachers would choose the district's program. Other teachers preferred *Amigos* and *Saludos*. However, 36% of the teachers felt the students liked the district program, 29% felt it was boring for the students, and 25% said it was fun for the students. Teachers felt the program needed lots of changes to make it better. Five (71%) of the schools proposed making the program more real-life, using actual or live objects. Four (57%) of the schools wanted additional characters added to the program, such as teachers and children. And, three schools (43%) said an improvement was needed with the pronunciation used by the program specialist on the tape or would prefer someone who was a native speaker. Twenty-two (79%) of the teachers said they would still teach Spanish even if there was no mandate and Spanish was the language of preference (54%).

IV. Research question #4:

According to teachers and principals, what is the ideal teaching situation for the instruction of Spanish in the elementary schools given the current situation?

Curtain & Pesola (1994) describe many models for foreign language instruction in the elementary schools: Language-Specialist Model, Classroom Teacher Model, Team Approach, Media-Based Model, Interactive Television, Nonspecialist Teacher/Volunteer, and Cross-Age Tutors. Each model has its strengths as well as its limitations. School districts and program planners must choose the model that achieves the language proficiency outcomes established as well as consider issues of budget and staffing.

When the twenty-eight teachers were asked to choose the ideal teaching situation at their individual schools for the instruction of Spanish if given the option to decide, fourteen teachers (50%) elected to have a foreign language specialist in order to facilitate language instruction. According to Curtain & Pesola (1994) this is the model that has been employed most often in FLES programs. The teachers' selection corresponds to the fourth hypothesis of this study, whereby the researcher proposed that teachers would choose a foreign language specialist versus individual foreign language training due to time constraints. Only four teachers (14%) chose having one teacher at each grade level be responsible for second language learning. This is undoubtedly due to the problem that there may or may not be a teacher at each grade level who could instruct the students in a foreign language. Curtain & Pesola (1994) suggest this team approach, instead of an individual classroom teacher, where one of the team members who is "usually better qualified by training and/or interest, teaches the language in several classrooms; in exchange, other team members offer instruction in other areas. This arrangement often helps to alleviate the morale problem otherwise encountered in this model" (41). Four teachers (14%) preferred receiving school-wide training for all teachers so that everyone would be held accountable as well as being equally prepared for foreign language instruction.

TABLE 14

Ideal teaching situation for Spanish instruction (teachers)

Preference	# of sample (N=28)
Foreign language specialist	50%
Other (mixture, bilingual aides, immersion programs, site-based coordinator)	21%
One teacher per grade level	14%
School-wide training of all teachers	14%

Informant F3 elected a foreign language specialist as the ideal teaching situation for Spanish. A regular classroom teacher would then be able to integrate the instruction taught by the specialist and use it throughout the day in the various subject areas as long as the teacher is fluent. This has been termed content-based instruction. Curtain (1991:327) explains:

> In a content-based foreign language lesson, the foreign language teacher carefully selects concepts from the regular curriculum that are clearly defined and do not require an excessive vocabulary load. The teacher takes into consideration the language skills, content skills, and cognitive skills required by the students in order to achieve success with the lesson. Content-based instruction is gaining more and more attention, because it allows schools to combine the goals of the second-language curriculum with some of the goals of the regular curriculum.

Content-based instruction has become a very pragmatic way of teaching in many elementary schools across the nation. For example, a third grade teacher might be doing a unit on the color wheel for Art. Instead of doing the lesson entirely in English, she might have the children use the Spanish words for colors while mixing paints like *rojo* (red) and *azul* (blue) together to create *morado* (purple). If the teacher was proficient with Spanish, the entire lesson would be done in Spanish. The children would be reinforcing regular content in addition to learning the Spanish words for colors and the Spanish language simultaneously.

There were six teachers (21%) who chose "Other responses" for the ideal teaching situation. Informant C5 suggested that there be a combination of all three options: foreign language specialist, one teacher per grade level, and school-wide training. This would perhaps guarantee accountability of language instruction across the school. The teachers who didn't speak Spanish would have the support of the specialist and the one teacher at their grade level for support but at the same time would be receiving school-wide training. This mixture would involve the whole school instead of a select few who are either highly motivated or have second language abilities.

The recruitment of bilingual instructional aides was the choice of Informant D6. Some schools have instructional assistants but they may or may not speak Spanish. With the ACL2's proposed plan of training native speakers, having a language proficient speaker in the classroom would offer immediate support to a teacher who does not possess second language skills.

Informants E6 and G6 felt that a school immersion program would be the ideal teaching situation. Immersion programs, according to Lipton (1994) are very few, only about 2-3% in the U.S. Nancy Rhodes & Lucinda Branaman of the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) are currently collecting data about foreign language programs which will include more current data on immersion programs and other foreign language programs at the elementary, middle, junior high, and high school levels across the nation. This study is funded by the U.S. Department of Education and will replace the landmark survey conducted by CAL in 1987 by Rhodes & Oxford. Results from the survey are expected to be completed in the Fall of 1997.

Informant C6 elected a site-based coordinator for the instruction of Spanish, who would work with the teachers and grade levels to organize visual/audio materials, assessments, programs, resources such as posters and charts, teacher training, and input and feedback. And finally, Informant G2 felt much like Informant C5 but chose a mixture of a foreign language specialist and school-wide training.

When the education program specialist, bilingual unit, at the Arizona Department of Education was asked what would be the most ideal teaching situation for foreign language

instruction, this participant chose a bilingual/bicultural program where instruction focuses on two languages. For example, English would be taught to LEP (Limited English Proficient) students and Spanish to monolingual English students which is known as a "Dual Language" program. (Personal interview, March, 1996).

Why would so many of the teachers choose a foreign language specialist versus other options? During the interview process, the researcher asked the informants if they spoke Spanish. Only six of the twenty-eight (21%) teachers interviewed said 'yes.'

TABLE 15

Speak Spanish

% of Sample (N=28)	Yes or No
79%	No
21%	Yes

Of the 28 teachers who said they didn't speak Spanish, there were teachers who spoke other languages. Two informants spoke German, four spoke French, one spoke a Chinese dialect and one spoke Dutch. The last two informants were native speakers of the Chinese dialect and Dutch.

Each informant was also asked to describe their Spanish proficiency. Results are shown in the following table:

TABLE 16

Description of Spanish proficiency

% of sample (N=28)	Levels of Spanish
50%	Minimal Speaker
25%	Other descriptions
11%	Non-Native Speaker
7%	Average Speaker
7%	Native Speaker

Seven informants (25%) described their Spanish proficiency in other ways. Informant C3 claimed to be a beginner student; C6, F4, and G2 said they had limited vocabulary; D4 possessed minimal conversation skills; E3 had two years of high school Spanish and two semesters at Mesa Community College; and E4 reported between average and minimal speaking skill.

As shown in Table 15, twenty-two teachers (79%) said they did not speak Spanish. This correlates with the previous finding that most teachers (50%) would prefer a foreign language specialist to teach Spanish mostly due to low levels of proficiency in the language.

Research question #4 was also asked of seven (N=7) principals. The principals were given the same choices as the teachers; however, they had distinct ideas about what the ideal teaching situation would be for foreign language instruction at their school.

TABLE 17

Ideal teaching situation for Spanish instruction (Principals)

School	N=7
A=Foreign language specialist	
B=School-wide training including administrative training as well	
C=Parent training like the Art Masterpiece Program[6] but Spanish "Masterpiece" with successful minority businessmen and women who use both languages	
D=Bilingual teacher in every class	
E=Immersion lab at each school to force students beyond the comfort zone and then after two weeks, a trained specialist would continue instruction	
F=School-wide training for all teachers	
G=1st choice school-wide training, 2nd choice foreign language specialist, 3rd one teacher per grade level	

Three out of seven principals (43%) chose school-wide training as their first preference for foreign language instruction at their school. The researcher speculates that school-wide training would have the greatest influence on the highest number of students but realizes that the commitment to learning Spanish at even an intermediate level would be overwhelming. However, its impact would be felt by all as teachers joined together in first learning Spanish themselves and then demonstrating an increased effort school-wide as children were taught. Unfortunately, in the interview process, all principals did not elaborate in detail the type, the content, or the length of the Spanish instruction. The other principals chose some kind of trained specialist whether it be a bilingual teacher or a parent/community volunteer.

Is there one best way to teach foreign language? Lipton (1990) addresses the different program models and states:

> The question is often raised as to which program model (FLEX, Sequential FLES, Immersion) is the BEST [sic]. The answer is that there is no simple answer, and that no one program model is best for all children and for all school districts. Needs may vary--budgets vary--goals may be different in different schools districts. For example, not all school districts opt to stress

> linguistic proficiency. Some stress internationalism, some may stress cultural awareness, some may stress providing foreign language instruction for all students rather than just a limited few. Therefore, decision makers must be aware that they must go through the various steps to get consensus in planning a long range program, despite the fact that a recent research study concluded that as far as language proficiency was concerned, the most effective program model was Immersion (256-57).

Lipton warns decision makers that the study did not control all the language components and it tried to compare "apples and oranges". Each program type has its own set of goals and objectives, and as long as these are clear to the district, the community, the teachers, and the students, the program model chosen will most likely have the potential to be successful.

In conclusion, as proposed in hypothesis #4, the majority of teachers (50%) chose a foreign language specialist as their ideal choice for Spanish instruction. This is probably related to the fact that the self-reported language proficiency of the teachers was low. Fifty percent of the teachers said they had a minimal level of proficiency. Only 21% said they spoke Spanish, 79% saying they didn't. Contradictory to hypothesis #4 was the fact that only three (43%) principals chose school-wide training as their first preference, while the others mentioned some kind of a trained specialist like the teachers, although the principals' perceptions of a trained specialist were varied. The researcher proposes that there would be a need for at least two specialists: one for the primary and one for the intermediate grades.

V. Research question #5:

What are the resources and materials that the seven schools use in the teaching of Spanish?

Data for research question #5 were gathered from twenty-eight teachers and seven media specialists. Besides the use of the district Spanish video program, teachers were asked what materials they use to improve instruction during the week. Most of the teachers chose "Other" (71%) as their preference for instruction. See the following tables for further details.

TABLE 18

Resources and materials for teaching Spanish

Resources and materials	N=28
Other	61%
Literature (picture books, stories)	46%
Drill and practice	46%
Songs	43%
Spanish speaking students	29%
Games	25%

Because "Other" was such a high percentage, the following table by school will further elucidate what resources and materials the teachers used.

TABLE 19

Other choices for resources and materials used by teachers

School	N=7
A=flash cards, bulletin boards, and sentence strips	
B= volunteer parents playing musical instruments, integration of vocabulary with the *Weekly Reader* [7]	
C=bulletin board displays and boxes with pockets containing vocabulary insets	
D=holiday activity booklets, parties, fiesta for *cinco de mayo*, charts with colors and numbers, and calendars	
E=pictures of animals, bulletin boards, charts, integrate Spanish into the curriculum in order to grasp Hispanic culture, integration of holiday units	
F=overhead activities with vocabulary, parent volunteers who teach Spanish, and holidays	
G=instruction of phrases using time and food; and audio-cassettes with Spanish vocabulary	

When the teachers did not know a word or needed help with Spanish, they would use the following resources to cope if they needed immediate instruction: teachers (50%); students (50%), dictionaries (25%), other (21%), teacher resource manuals (14%), and

resource audio tapes (11%). Other resources included: Spanish-speaking classified personnel like the custodian, LEP(Limited English Proficient)teacher, vocabulary guides, the book Spanish Is Fun, pronunciation guide in a Spanish teaching manual, and lastly a parent volunteer. It appears that even though colleagues were not a strong motivator in motivating teachers to use Spanish in the classroom as reflected in Table 9, when teachers needed assistance in using Spanish, they turned to colleagues who presumably spoke Spanish.

School C had a unique resource person called a Family Liaison funded under the Title One Program from the State. This participant was interviewed (See Appendix K) by the researcher to find out the role of liaisons in the district. Participant C7 held a B.A. in Special Education with a minor in Elementary Education and spoke fluent Spanish as a Mexican American. C7's job was created because of the need for more communication to occur between school and home. The participant had been at School C for two years at the time of the interview (May, 1996). Time is spent translating, interpreting, working with Title One children, conferencing with teachers and staff and meeting with monolingual Spanish-speaking parents. C7 also works with parents once a week for 90 minutes instructing them in computers, the use of office equipment like the xerox machine, etc. This participant also helps coordinate workshops for parents in conjunction with the basic skills specialist at School C by translating and preparing materials in Spanish. The liaison interacts with parents by phone, does home visits when necessary, communicates with teachers if there is a language barrier and observes students to gather data for placement or for communication to parents. This has helped establish a bond between the teachers and the parents who may never communicate with one another due to language deficiencies in Spanish and English. Out of the seven schools, School C was the only school with a liaison. This kind of resource could be a valuable tool at other schools where the Hispanic population is strong.

As noted, there is a wide range of resources used at MPS. This is also evident at the media centers of each school. According to the seven media specialists, the following materials and resources were available in each school's media center (library) to help foster

Spanish language development. All seven (100%) of the schools had children's books in Spanish. Six media centers (86%) had videos in Spanish. Five schools (71%) had Spanish teaching manuals to assist teachers in learning Spanish. Three schools (43%) had computer software for Spanish learning. Other available materials were bilingual books, Spanish dictionaries, translated books, tapes, blackline masters (dittos), and nonfiction how-to books.

The media specialists were asked what resources would enhance foreign language instruction at their schools. They listed bilingual books, Spanish books, Spanish picture books, teacher resource manuals, audiotapes, picture dictionaries in Spanish, and basic beginner language software to use in the computer labs.

Six media specialists said that students at their schools were using Spanish books consistently. Three schools (43%) said that students were checking books out once in awhile and four (57%) said that books were checked out frequently. The most common type of books used by the students were Spanish only books (57%) and picture books (57%). Other resources like nonfiction Spanish , chapter books and picture dictionaries were also available for use. Only School D had a policy for purchasing foreign language materials and none of the media specialists felt the purchase of materials had been affected in any way by the English Only Proposition.

Four media specialists (57%) said that teachers at their school requested books and foreign language materials from the media specialist in order to teach Spanish to their students. The teachers basically have asked for videos from the district, dictionaries, picture books for easy reading, and books for LEP (Limited English Proficient) students.

In conclusion, these data corroborate hypothesis #5, which proposed that Mesa teachers would utilize and develop additional materials to teach Spanish in the classroom in addition to the district's Spanish video program for Spanish instruction. This is evident by the number of "Other" resources and materials that the teachers were using as indicated by Table 19. The media specialists felt that they needed to add more bilingual books, Spanish books, and picture books to the Media Center to enhance foreign language instruction (see Appendix P for other resources available for the purchase of Spanish materials as well as

articles, addresses of vendors and conferences that offer sources to help teachers better adapt to Spanish instruction).

VI. Research question #6:

Regarding assessment, what impact did the 1995 Spanish Language Assessment, which was given to third graders, have on the instruction of Spanish by teachers of this grade level?

Research data on the proficiency levels of students in immersion and FLES programs in the U.S. has been very limited due to the fact that good research is expensive and foreign language instruction has been low on the list of priorities of most funding agencies who provide funds for such studies. In the U.S., testing has been limited when it comes to assessing the foreign language proficiency of younger learners. However, during the 1980's the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) took a leading role in investigating issues related to early-language learning. They gathered data on the extent of foreign language instruction in the elementary grades, compiled lists of the various program types, facilitated networking among professionals in the language field and developed two instruments described below for evaluating Spanish oral proficiency of immersion and FLES students (Wang, Richardson, & Rhodes, 1988; Thompson, Richardson, Wang, & Rhodes, 1988).

An adaptation of the ACTFL oral proficiency guidelines was used by Phillips & Liskin-Gasparro in testing students in Pittsburgh. Phillips believed that the modified version of the ACTFL scale was more valuable in learning about formative program assessments than for verifying the language skills of children (Met, 1991). Met cautions that there is no research base to support the validity or the reliability of the scale; the test does offer insight into the students' language development, but she is unsure if the scale measures proficiency with validity and reliability.

The Clear Oral Proficiency Exam (COPE) follows the ACTFL/ETS oral proficiency interview and evaluates students' receptive and productive oral skills using the school context as its base. For example, students would role-play a conversation using

subject matter and social language (interacting with other children) related to their school setting. Students are assessed on fluency, vocabulary, grammar, and comprehension. The COPE has been used extensively in Spanish as well as other languages (Curtain & Pesola, 1994). The FLES Test is an achievement test used to assess the skills of students who have had from one to three hours per week of Spanish instruction over a two to six year time frame. Listening and reading skills in the language are evaluated by content frequently used in FLES curricula such as greetings, family, classroom objects, parts of the body, etc. (Met, 1991). Curtain & Pesola (1994) add that the FLES Test was developed to measure achievement by students whose language ability was not as advanced as those measured by the COPE.

What assessment technique does MPS use? In order to assess the Spanish acquisition achieved by the students, a written test was given to third grade students across the entire district at more than 40 elementary schools during January and February of 1995. Previously, teacher-made assessment tests were performed by individual classroom teachers but not for an entire student body. Beforehand, teachers had not been held accountable for Spanish instruction, indicating that a written record of a student's progress in the language was not required. Then, during the 1994-1995 school year, assessment of Spanish was administered via a video tape created by the resource teacher for Mesa Public Schools and Educational TV and monitored by each individual classroom teacher. The test contained 40 questions which assessed the students' knowledge of Spanish phrases and vocabulary relating to numbers, colors, animals, seasons, weather, clothing, parts of the day, days of the week, months of the year and people. For example, on the first section, Animals, students were shown three pictures of different animals and then they would bubble in the correct response based on a sentence spoken by the resource teacher (see Appendix L for further explanations of each test section).

Each student had a test booklet and would listen to the audio cassette to answer the questions. The tests were graded by the district in the spring of 1995 and the results were sent to each school via the Research and Evaluation Department of Mesa Public Schools. Highlights of the results were given to elementary principals in the form of a memo on

March 27, 1995. The following results were summarized and distributed to personnel involved and interested in the test:

*Competency was defined as 80% correct. This was achieved by 91% of students.
*The overall average was 92% correct.
*All schools tested all or most of their third graders.

Therefore, when the researcher asked the five informants what effect the Spanish Test of 1995 had had on instruction in their classroom, the answers were in accord with hypothesis #6, which proposed that the mandate would have positive results towards the integration of Spanish instruction.[8] For the first time, teachers were held accountable for the Spanish instruction they were required to teach. Informant A3 said more thorough instruction occurred; B4 implemented Spanish instruction into the lesson plans and made evaluations of the students' progress; C6 did more pacing of the instruction and an increased focus on Spanish; D5 spent more time teaching Spanish; and G3 replied that it gave an interest that wasn't there before and made it more fun.

How did the teachers feel about the Spanish test results that were sent to the schools in the Spring of 1995? Informant A3 said they were amazed at the score, B4 felt good about the results, C6 was surprised by the good scores, E3 was pleased and G3 was excited to hear the results.[9]

The same test was administered to the third graders in the spring of 1996 and 1997. However, there were several changes from the first test given in 1995. The 1995 test had a deadline date of February to complete the test; consequently, instruction began early in 1994 to accommodate this deadline. Thereafter, the tests were included in the teachers' individual kits which were requested along with their Science and Social Studies curricula and were due sometime before the end of the year, meaning May of 1996 and May of 1997. Another change from the first test given in 1995 was that the teachers turned in a *Competency Mastery Form* for the 1996 and 1997 test that consisted of a yes/no tracking checklist for the teacher to complete on each of the areas: animals, numbers, colors, weather, clothes, days, months, and people. A problem with this was the dilemma faced

by teachers of what constituted "mastery." On one section of the test there were only three questions referring to the concept of "people". Was mastery demonstrated by correctly answering three out of three or two out of three? Teachers used their own personal judgment regarding mastery. Therefore, test results were inconsistent across the district due to lack of guidelines for mastery.

The test results for last year's (May 1997) Spanish test showed that out of 5,309 students who took the test, a total of 4,947 students demonstrated mastery at 93%. The seven schools in this research project had the following percentages: School A-94%; School B-95%; School C-100%; School D-88%; School E-92%, School F-95%, and School G-98%. The average for the seven schools was a 95%. Unfortunately, School C reported incorrectly and should not have received a 100% mastery (Personal Interview, Sept. 1997 Science/Social Sciences Resource Center). Several teachers have given the district feedback and have suggested that a clarification be given for exactly what mastery consists of and a remodification of the report form.

In a memorandum dated September 22, 1997, sent out to third grade teachers across the district, communication was given on consolidating the entire Spanish program for grades 1-3. One decision was to eliminate the unit called *Spanish Finding Out* and only using the *Spanish Count Down For Earth* unit. From this unit, the cumulative test covering skills addressed in the Spanish units from first, second, and third grade will be given once again for students in third grade for the 1997-1998 school year. Once again teacher judgement regarding the students' mastery of a particular skill was given. But in the memorandum to clarify what mastery was, a table was given to be used as a guide. It included the area tested, (Animals, Numbers, Colors, Weather, Clothes, Days, Months, People) the number correct for mastery and the total number of questions possible. For example, for the problem area mentioned above, the table indicates that students could answer two questions out of three in the "People" section in order to reach mastery. This additional clarification on scoring the test will aid in more accurate and more consistent results across the district. Changes are in progress as communication continues to be voiced between teachers and the new directors of Spanish in the district.

Another problem with the tracking checklist was that it applied to two different Spanish kits: *Spanish Finding Out* and *Spanish Count Down For Earth* , and there was a deleted category if you used the *Count Down* test. The category "Days" on the tracking checklist could refer to the time of day as in 'morning,' 'afternoon,' and 'evening', or days of the week as in Sunday through Saturday. These two concepts needed separate categories on the tracking checklist or further instructions so that teachers understood that they could be combined. This issue was not addressed on the recent memorandum sent on September 22, 1997.

Unfortunately, the results of the 1995 test were not shared with parents, with the exception of School E, which actually placed the grades on the report card. Heining-Boynton (1990) did an analysis and synthesis of the research on why FLES programs were unsuccessful during the 50s and 60s; and one of the reasons was that there was a lack of homework, grades and evaluation. Foreign language instruction during the 50s and 60s was simply not graded but children were constantly reminded of the importance of doing well. The question then arises: how can Mesa schools convince parents and students of the importance of foreign language if test results are not sent home? Heining-Boynton (1990:506) states: "As we also know, grades give the student an indication and evaluation, subjective as it may be, of progress. FLES students from the fifties and sixties remarked that they, in many cases, needed a sign that advancement was taking place."

Furthermore, the teachers were asked whether they would still administer the test if given the option, what they perceived their students' reactions were to the test and whether they had received training and instruction prior to administering the test. All (100%) third grade teachers who had administered the test responded that if given the option to give the test or not, they would still administer the test to their students. When first asked the question by the researcher, informant A3 had offered a negative response. However, after experiencing firsthand the administration of the test, A3 changed the response to an affirmative choice.

What were the reactions of the students, according to the teachers? The following comments summarize how the students reacted to the test as perceived by the teachers:

A3- "students liked it, there weren't any problems"; B4- "students were anxious, yet confident"; C6- "test goals were the expected as given by the district"; D5- "students were tense at first, yet felt the test was fun and easy", E3- "students felt comfortable taking the test"; G3- "students said it was easy because they felt prepared".

Did the teachers receive training from the district prior to administering the exam? Four of the six (67%) third grade teachers who had experience with the test (1995 or 1996) said they had not received training[8]. Teacher G3 explained that the head teacher at their school offered the needed training due to the teacher's high language proficiency, and Teacher E3 was the only one who received training from a district representative. The other teachers used the teacher's guide in the district kit and trained themselves. Training was an option offered to any teacher who desired assistance by the district. However, each individual could receive further training with the Spanish Kits by indicating this request on the Science and Social Studies Plan Sheet that each teacher fills out at the end of the school year in May.

When asked "*If you could make any changes in the test, what would they be?,*" the resource teacher responded by stating that no major changes would be made other than the correction of errors with the technology of the test as indicated earlier. For example, on the video test, a picture of "spring" was shown for what should have been a picture of "summer" in the section on "Weather. The resource teacher liked having the test on the video so that it was consistent in each classroom, and it gave the children a human voice to respond to as they were answering questions. One of the most important things that the district could do was to assure that the schools and the teachers received an official printout of the results. This would indicate that the results were as important as any other test given in the district and would serve to motivate teachers to continue with their efforts in foreign language instruction. This was the teachers' only "payoff" from the mandate that they had done a good job in implementing Spanish instruction at their schools. Unfortunately, the results were given only to the superintendent in 1996 and 1997 and not sent directly to the schools or the teachers who had implemented the program. Budget cuts made it difficult to disseminate the results district wide (Personal interview, Resource Teacher, March, 1996).

When asked "*What changes would you implement in the teaching materials?*" the response was to begin earlier, perhaps in kindergarten, teaching the Spanish phonetic system and introducing reading in first grade and writing in second grade or when it is naturally given in English. The resource teacher was instructed by the district not to incorporate these skills in the first and second grade units because of the fear that children would confuse the two languages. The resource teacher felt that limiting children to just oral instruction was incorrect when there were four skills to learning a language: listening, speaking, reading and writing. In an interview with the director of the Science and Social Sciences Department for MPS, an explanation was offered for keeping the first and second grade units audio-based programs only:

> There were a large group of primary teachers who came to us and said that they were very concerned at that point in time with a very strong phonics reading program. And they did not want the district to produce or to use something in Spanish which would introduce Spanish sounds of the learners at the same time that they were trying to get the English sounds of the letters. And so the agreement was that we would use basically oral Spanish only through second grade so that the English phonics program could be firmly rooted...And then we can begin to introduce written Spanish in the third grade (Personal interview, March 1996).

Besides the Spanish test, other types of evaluation were used by the teachers to assess the acquisition of Spanish across the district. Teachers were asked the following question: "*What types of evaluation do you use to assess the acquisition of Spanish?*" The following responses were given:

- Classroom participation (54%)
- Teacher-made quizzes (21%)
- Teacher observation (18%)
- Rubrics (0%)
- District Spanish Test (32%)
- Games (21%)
- District Spanish booklets (11%)
- Other types of evaluation (68%)

Classroom participation refers to the student becoming actively involved in the lesson by speaking or physically moving to commands or games. Teacher observation is used to verify if a student understands. For example, as the students sing a song like *Cabeza, cara, hombros, pies*, (head, face, shoulders, and feet) that refers to body parts, the teacher

observes whether the students are pointing to the correct body part while singing. Rubrics are previously defined criteria for the comprehension and mastery of a particular concept. See the following table for "Other" evaluations used by the teachers for the assessment of Spanish acquisition.

TABLE 20

Other types of evaluation for assessment of Spanish acquisition

School A=Oral quizzes, teacher observation.
School B=Overhead projector activities, holistic approach, observation, worksheets, oral games.
School C=Visual observation, whole group instruction, flash cards.
School D=Whole group instruction, worksheets, native speaker quizzes students.
School E=Activities on the bulletin board, oral practice, question/answer, activity sheets, teacher observation.
School F=Student participation, reciting vocabulary, reinforcing and reviewing skills, speaking to LEP students.
School G=Student-made dictionaries with vocabulary, teacher observation, oral quizzes, listening activities, assembly in Spanish, Spanish spelling test.

In sum, based on the percentage of students (91%) who passed the district test in 1995 and the viewpoints of the teachers regarding the test, hypothesis #6 held true in stating that the assessment had caused positive results towards the integration of Spanish instruction to children. All (100%) of the teachers said they would still give the test if given the option not to. The students, as perceived by the teachers, liked the test. The researcher has noted the same responses in her classroom. Students are nervous at first but usually feel very confident as they take the test because they have been prepared by the teacher. As proposed in hypothesis #6, teachers were held accountable, which stimulated more instruction to occur in the classroom.

VII. Research question #7:

Do Mesa teachers, principals, and media specialists feel Spanish instruction is an important part of a student's curriculum?

There are many diverse opinions within an educational setting or institution on whether teaching Spanish is important. Some teachers feel that if a child comes to their classroom and is assigned the label of a Limited English Proficient (LEP) student, then Spanish should play a lesser role of importance in the child's instructional day. Other educators are of the opinion that teaching Spanish distracts from other core areas of the curriculum, specifically reading, mathematics and written language.

Is the study of foreign language important, then? Garfinkel & Tabor (1991:376) quote Benevento (1985) as stating that "foreign language study no longer is viewed merely as an esoteric college-entrance requirement for the elite, but as an effective way for all students to learn about another language and culture and, thus, better understand their own." Through the medium of foreign language study, English skills are enhanced. The purpose of foreign language study is to provide individuals who can use the language in a useful and communicative way. In the opinion of Schinke-Llano (1985), FLES programs provide students with necessary experiences to conquer a second language. Garfinkel & Tabor (1991:376) summarize the opinions of Schinke-Llano to say "that students who have participated in FLES programs seem to perform better on a number of measures than those who have not taken part in FLES programs." Rafferty (1986) compared achievement of students in third, fourth, and fifth grades in the area of language arts. Some of these students had 30 minutes of elementary foreign language instruction, others did not. Results of this statewide study showed that those having second language instruction outscored those who didn't. Test scores were more than doubled for the fifth graders, indicating that the longer students are in a continuous process of language study, the better their test scores. Hakuta (1986) found that bilingual children outperformed monolingual children in cognitive flexibility. He proposed that bilingual children have an advantage in learning a second language without prohibiting the cognitive development of their first language. However, not all researchers would agree with Hakuta's viewpoint. Dolson

(1984) was one such researcher that would tend to be in accord with those teachers who are concerned with students losing academically if they study a second language. As reported by Garfinkel & Tabor (1991:337), Dolson "suggests that FLES be postponed until students are functionally literate in their native language, because some investigators (names not mentioned) have concluded that foreign language students may initially lag behind those who do not study foreign languages in areas such as basic English literacy."

Of the twenty-eight teachers interviewed, twenty-five (89%) felt that teaching Spanish in their classrooms was important. The following table indicates each schools' responses toward Spanish instruction:

TABLE 21

Importance of teaching Spanish (teachers)

School
A=Proximity to Mexico, learnability among children, helps children to get along with one another in a community. Foreign language is a weak area in the curriculum and needs to be integrated fully across the state.
B=Being bilingual opens doors to other cultures, puts parents at ease when both languages are an option, provides children with an understanding of the Hispanic culture and the Southwest in general, and affords students the opportunity to learn about Arizona's people and history.
C=Close proximity of Arizona to Mexico, and learning a language at an early age is easier for children.
D=Opens opportunities for children in the areas of music and literature, provides more competitive opportunities in the work place and is important because of the large Hispanic population in Arizona.
E=Spanish speaking population in Arizona, offers more advantages when traveling to a Latin American country, without a foreign language we are illiterate compared to the rest of the world, languages facilitate competitiveness in the real world, and bilingualism creates global competiveness.
F=Geographical location in relation to Mexico, its importance to the global and political economy, and language offers sensitivity and exposure to the Hispanic population and culture.
G=Important for world harmony, offers an appreciation for Hispanic culture, fluency in another language offers an appreciation for one's own language reasoning skills, it's easier to learn another language as a child, Spanish helps develop a global society, it gives exposure to people's beliefs and internal feelings, and it can teach grammar to children.

There were three teachers who felt teaching Spanish wasn't important. Informant C4 said that Spanish should not be taught in the elementary schools and that reading should be the number one priority, making Spanish a low priority. Informant D3 felt that if the basics were strong in a school, Spanish could be a part of the curriculum; if the basics weren't present, then Spanish should not be taught. Informant E7 felt Spanish should not be part of the content area at the elementary level due to time constraints of other core subjects, the use of the district video and the current application of its use.

Principals and media specialists were also asked the same question. All seven (100%) of the principals felt Spanish should be taught in the elementary schools. Their responses are summarized in the following table:

TABLE 22

Importance of teaching Spanish (principals)

School A=Sector of Hispanics is predominant; market niches in Motorola; Intel; career opportunities.
School B= Geographic region; personal goal; ethnicity of students; foreign language benefits.
School C=Better person; foreign language in Southwest; build relationships with Spanish monolinguals.
School D=Cultural effects on monolinguals; geographic proximity to Mexico; two languages is a gift.
School E=Receptivity in the brain when student is below 12 years of age; become understanding and compassionate; location in the Southwest.
School F=Second language should be taught with liberal arts; better understanding of English; pragmatic advantage over others.
School G=Creates cultural bridges at school during the day; encourages literacy with Hispanic neighbors; because of the ESL population and minority bilingual group; create more accepting culture by learning Spanish.

In a previous 1985 study undertaken in Maryland, Baranick & Markham (1986) found that slightly more than half (N=268) of the surveyed elementary principals had a positive attitude toward foreign language instruction but implementing a program was not high on their list of priorities. A total of 54% of the respondents felt that a second language should be a part of their school curriculum and the majority of the principals (91%) would have chosen Spanish. For those who were against having a foreign language program, 33% of the principals responded that the reason was for "lack of time during the school day."

And lastly, the media specialists from Mesa were asked if they thought teaching Spanish was important at their school. Six (86%) replied in the affirmative. Informant G5

said that they wanted to wait for further legislation on the subject but that in third grade it was important. The following table summarizes their responses:

TABLE 23

Importance of teaching Spanish (media specialists)
N=7

A5=multiculturalism, global world, holiday celebration like *cinco de mayo*.
B6=close to Mexico.
C2=foreign language is easier to learn as a child.
D2=Hispanic population of the Southwest has increased, part of culture, being bilingual is important.
E2=we're not by ourselves, world power to know a foreign language.
F2=it's good for a person to learn a second language, foreign language helps with English, bilingual people are smart.
G5=at our school Spanish isn't important until the legislature gets their act together. We don't have time to teach Spanish. In the third grade it is important.

In conclusion, teachers (89%), principals (100%) and media specialists (86%) feel that Spanish is an important part of a child's curriculum in the elementary school as proposed by hypothesis #7 because:

- children are more receptive to learning a foreign language;
- it impacts Arizona's economic competitiveness;
- our proximity to Mexico in the Southwest;
- advantages of being bilingual etc.

No one mentioned, as proposed in the hypothesis, that Spanish language instruction formed an integral part or core of the educational continuum for foreign language selection through high school and college. It is is important to note that only two (7%) of the teachers had had foreign language education in the elementary schools. These were in Panama and France. A few teachers had taken a foreign language in junior high and high school. Foreign language in the elementary schools has definitely increased here in Mesa

at the seven schools and it is the researcher's hope that this will impact enrollment in the years to come so that proficiency in the target language and an appreciation and understanding of the target culture will be the norm rather than the exception.

CHAPTER FIVE

1. Summary of findings

This section highlights key findings based on the seven research questions discussed in Chapter Four.

1. Teacher Preparation:

•Fourteen teachers (50%) had taken classes to prepare for and enhance Spanish ability.

• Teachers preferred training in grammar and pronunciation (29%), teaching methods (25%), and games and songs (14%) over training in theories of language learning (0%).

2. Perception of Teachers and Principals:

•Teachers' perceptions towards Spanish instruction revealed a higher receptivity towards language teaching than parents, the community, the school, and their colleagues.

•Teachers were most motivated to use Spanish because of the large Hispanic population in Mesa and their own personal interest.

•Principals' perceptions towards Spanish instruction revealed that students would have a more positive response to Spanish than teachers, parents and community.

3. Curricular Changes in MPS:

•The district video program rated by twenty-one teachers received a mid-range average score of 3.1 on a scale with five as the highest.

•Teachers' comments about the district video program appeared to be more negative than positive with only four (14%) of the teachers choosing it as an instructional tool.

•Thirty-six percent of the teachers felt the students liked the district program, 29% felt it was boring for the students, and 25% said it was fun for the students.

•Regarding the district's video program, proposed changes included: making the program more real-life by using actual or live objects, adding additional characters to the program such as teachers and children, and improving the pronunciation used by the resource teacher and/or using a native speaker.

•Seventy-nine percent of the teachers said they would still teach Spanish even if there weren't a mandate, and Spanish would be the language of preference.

4. Ideal Teaching Situation:

•Fifty percent of the teachers chose a foreign language specialist as their preference for Spanish instruction. This may be related to the fact that the self-reported language proficiency of the teachers was low. Only 21% said they spoke Spanish; 79% said they did not.

•Only three (43%) of the principals chose school-wide training. The other four (57%) chose some kind of a trained specialist, with various perceptions of his or her role.

5. Resources and Materials:

•Mesa teachers have utilized and developed additional materials like flash cards, bulletin board displays, volunteers, holiday activities, culture integration, audio-cassettes, bilingual dictionaries, language manuals, Spanish books, etc. to teach language in the classroom, in addition to the district's Spanish video program for instruction.

•Teachers also used other Spanish speaking teachers or school personnel, Hispanic students and a family liaison resource person to serve as resources when additional communication and help was necessary.

•Media specialists felt that they needed to add more bilingual books, Spanish books, and picture books to the Media Centers to enhance foreign language instruction.

6. Spanish Foreign Language Assessment:

•On the Spanish Foreign Language Assessment given to most of the third graders in 1995, competency was defined as 80% correct and was achieved by 91% of the 5,014 students tested across the district. The overall average for the district was 92% correct on the 40-item test.

•The teachers were held accountable for their Spanish teaching, which stimulated more foreign language instruction in the classroom.

7. Importance of Spanish Instruction:

•Teachers (89%), principals (100%) and media specialists (86%) felt that Spanish is an important part of a child's curriculum in the elementary school for the following reasons: children are more receptive to learning a foreign language, learning Spanish impacts Arizona's economic competitiveness with others, Arizona is geographically close to Mexico, and there are many advantages to being bilingual.

II. Conclusions

The present study had the following goals: 1) to discover what curriculum changes have occurred in the Mesa Public Schools since the Arizona Foreign Language Mandate was passed in 1989, 2) to identify the resources and materials that were currently being used, 3) to present the assessment results from the Spanish Foreign Language Assessment given to third graders in 1995, and 4) to share information with administrators and teachers in order to emphasize the importance of foreign language continuation in the district. The research focused on seven schools in Mesa, with the desired outcomes being: 1) to provide information for new teachers in the district; 2) to serve as a potential foundation for the establishment of future Spanish programs; 3) to serve as a possible planning guide for future curriculum development; 4) to create an awareness of the strategies currently being used in MPS elementary classrooms for teaching Spanish; and 5) to serve as a potential resource of communication among the more than 40 elementary schools that are ethnically, economically, and academically diverse.

From this study, it is learned that teachers felt Spanish instruction was important, but they lacked the necessary skills to teach a foreign language in a more proficient manner. Teachers expressed a desire to enroll in more classes to enhance their grammar and pronunciation skills but lacked the necessary time. It is not required for teachers in Mesa to be proficient in a language before they teach it. Spanish is taught in grades one through six by regular classroom teachers who may or may not speak Spanish. According to Rosenbusch (1995a &b) this was one of the factors that led to the disappearance of the foreign language programs in the 1950s and 1960s. If a continuation of quality Spanish

instruction is to occur at MPS, extensive efforts on behalf of the district need to occur in the training of teachers so that children will be the beneficiaries.

Even though the overall general response to the district video program was negative, it has served to assist teachers who do not speak Spanish. One of the primary reasons that MPS developed the video program was directly related to the lack of qualified second language teachers. This program created by the district was the best option after considering the expense and time of training hundreds of teachers and hiring foreign language specialists at the then forty-eight elementary schools. The request by the State that school districts across Arizona incorporate the study of foreign languages in the elementary schools came very suddenly to unprepared teachers and administrators; consequently, school districts such as MPS faced a lack of linguistically proficient teachers, and no extensive teacher training, and the creation of a video program then became the panacea.

Rosenbusch (1991) stated that one of the best methods school districts can use to prepare teachers is to request that the State Department of Education establish certification standards for elementary school foreign language teachers who would receive the necessary training through colleges and universities. I concur with Rosenbusch's assessment, because the majority of teachers are not going to become qualified to teach a foreign language unless the option becomes available and the State requires it in order to teach. There needs to be state certification standards developed to collaborate with universities to develop programs and classes so that elementary teachers can become certified as well as qualified to teach Spanish. One would never elect to receive surgery from a medical doctor who had not received the proper training or certification. Asking teachers to be motivated to teach Spanish when training has not been required or given is ludicrous. In the Tucson Unified School District extensive staff development, workshops on teaching methodology, and materials development has been offered to help prepare teachers to teach Spanish (Personal interview, September, 1997). Mesa Public Schools does offer Spanish classes, but it is not required nor is there the necessary motivation from the individual schools or district to take them.

In North Carolina, a state where foreign language was also mandated, a teacher preparation project was begun through the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, with technical assistance from the Center for Applied Linguistics. This project was funded by the Legislature and a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education, to build on the experiences of successful teachers already teaching in the elementary schools and through collaboration with college and university methods instructors. By working as teams they developed "1) an intensive seminar on elementary school foreign language methodology; 2) direct observations of local elementary school foreign language classes; 3) co-teaching in elementary school classrooms; and 4) collaboration in the development of a teacher education curriculum" (Curtain & Pesola 1994:244). The project, funded first by their Legislature, was completed in August of 1992, and the professors have incorporated the new methods and materials into their teacher preparation programs as well as for use with their undergraduate students. As a result of this project, two important outcomes have occurred: "1) recommended curriculum for preparing foreign language teachers at the elementary school level, and 2) the development of a list of competencies for the K-8 foreign language teacher" (Curtain & Pesola 1994:245). I found this level of commitment and collaboration between schools and universities exemplary, as they both worked towards a common goal: the training of existing as well as future teachers. A successful FLES program must have the training of teachers as an absolute priority. If foreign language instruction is going to be effective and continue in MPS, staff development needs to be organized so that children are receiving the best possible language preparation. However, great care needs to be given to the requirement of teaching a foreign language. The majority of teachers interviewed wanted more training, but it would be more professional if teachers were asked first of their interest and then offered the training as their choice. This would allow those teachers who are interested and motivated to become trained in teaching Spanish. I believe it would cause ill feelings towards foreign language education if suddenly <u>all</u> elementary teachers were required to receive training. Therefore, Arizona school districts and universities need to work together with guidelines from the State in order to develop teacher training and

design curriculum. Articulation from the elementary level up to the college level needs to combine the talents of all so that quality support and training are the norm instead of the exception.

Due to the alarmingly low percentage of teachers interviewed in the seven schools in Mesa who spoke Spanish, there needs to be more communication between the communities and the schools where outside help may alleviate some of the pressures of teaching Spanish. According to Curtain & Pesola, (1994) nonspecialist teachers/volunteers and cross-age tutors can meet the needs of certain programs when they are carefully trained by language specialists who assist the teachers on a continual basis. Nonspecialist teachers could be college students studying languages, parents, community workers, high school or college language teachers, etc. Curtain & Pesola (1994:46) caution that these "staffing options . . . are not suitable for long-term, articulated FLES programs," but the researcher feels that the non-proficient teachers in Mesa would greatly welcome volunteers to assist them with Spanish instruction if they--the volunteers--had received training from the district before entering their classrooms.

At the last meeting of the ACL2 held October 18, 1997, a discussion by Dr. Overall, President, of the group, centered on finding native speakers (NS) who are proficient in Spanish. The NS would need a minimum of a high school education and would need to receive teacher preparation by taking a bilingual exam and completing three classes: 1) a methods FLES class through Distance Learning at NAU and A.S.U. (to be planned) or on-site training, 2) Introduction to Linguistics or an equivalent class, and 3) a Child Development class. After completing this preparation, the NS would do a practicum at a school for further training. This would help support Spanish instruction in the classroom (Personal interview, Dr. Guntermann, A.S.U., October 29, 1997).

For those five third grade teachers interviewed who had given the Spanish Language Assessment in 1995, all felt the test had had positive impact upon Spanish instruction in their classrooms. The teachers were held accountable for the instruction given to the students because an assessment was required. Rosenbusch (1995b) also identified lack of evaluation procedures as another factor affecting foreign language success

in the 1950s and 1960s. Teachers, students and programs need to be evaluated to identify their strengths and weaknesses. Evaluation can help solve problems, provide ongoing information, and verify and substantiate successes (Heining-Boynton, 1991). All established programs need to attempt to avoid the mistakes of the past. Heining-Boynton (1991) developed the FLES Program Evaluation Inventory (FPEI), which consists of five evaluative parts for: 1) teachers, 2) principals and administrators,3) classroom teachers, 4) children and 5) parents. The five forms of the FPEI were based on earlier FLES programs in the United States and current issues of the nineties such as "1) FLES teacher acceptance by colleagues; 2) workload; 3) the at-risk student; and 4) scheduling competition with the other content areas"(Heining-Boynton, 1991:194). The five forms of the FPEI incorporated historical issues from the 1950s and 1960s plus current FLES issues in the the field of foreign language education. The evaluation was reviewed by FLES educators and administrators and revisions were made based on their input. The FPEI was piloted in two school districts in North Carolina with 20 FLES teachers, 40 administrators, 400 classroom teachers and 7,000 children (Heining-Boynton, 1991). I believe that this type of an evaluation would provide essential data for MPS in order to discover the needs of all those involved in FLES. As Heining-Boynton (1991:197) states:

> It is important that FLES educators, curriculum developers, and/or administrators use a comprehensive program evaluation form. With a well constructed assessment device, program evaluation provides valuable data that enable program improvement and innovations. Also, documentation of program successes can help insure the continuation and growth of FLES at the local and national levels.

An evaluation tool such as this one would benefit foreign language instruction in Mesa because it would offer documentation district-wide. It would also create an awareness to all personnel that Spanish instruction is important and that the purpose of such an evaluation would serve not just to document a problem but to identify possible problems so that solutions could be found.

We live in a unique area within the Southwest where many cultures and peoples interact on a daily basis. Foreign language instruction in Arizona has been a reality for many years. The passage of the foreign language mandate has given focus and direction to

many school districts and in particular to Mesa as they attempt to integrate Spanish programs and instruction for children. One may stop and ask why are we teaching Spanish in the first place. What purpose does assessment, program development, teacher training, and materials creation have in Mesa and across the state? When all is said and done, we as educators have the responsibility to offer our students every opportunity necessary to become successful citizens. Language is communication. Language is a part of culture. Language is a way to join people together in a world where understanding and appreciation are an integral part of our lives. As Dr. William Hopkins (1992) concluded at the keynote speech delivered for the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages in November, 1991, in Washington, DC:

> Foreign language skills may never involve the student in multi million dollar, international business deals; they may never involve him or her in global research projects in science or math; or get him or her to a U.S.-Soviet Summit meeting. But even if all foreign language skills are able to do is to allow the individual some time to establish human contact with another culture, to give him or her the chance of understanding and appreciating, on a personal level, another way of living in the world--then this alone justifies all the effort of teaching and of learning those skills (154).

In conclusion, what motivates the individual teacher or school district to continue foreign language instruction depends chiefly on his or her past experience with a language. This researcher learned Spanish as an adult out of necessity to communicate with the people of Chile to whom she had been assigned as a welfare missionary. How much better it would have been if I had been offered the study of foreign language as a child. Successes would have been perhaps unmeasurable. My motivation to continue teaching Spanish is the fact that children are so much more accepting of new ways of thinking than adults. And, because it takes years for proficiency to occur, starting in the elementary schools with qualified teachers who have been properly trained will augment the success of foreign language education in MPS. As Lipton (1994: 11) states: "Years after former FLES* students have grown up and pursued different careers, they often remember their first experience with the study of a foreign language. Furthermore, their FLES* experience is usually successful, since 'very few children fail FLES*' (Cribari, 1993).

III. Limitations

In order to shed more light on the effectiveness of FLES programs in MPS, an investigator would need to interview personnel at more schools than just seven. Mesa Public Schools has over 48 elementary schools, with approximately 30 teachers at each school. As the 28 teachers were interviewed, the need for more research was self-evident. The whole process was very rewarding for most of the teachers, and many of them asked why no one had inquired about Spanish instruction before. Because the interviewing was so positive, I felt the experience could have been very rewarding for more teachers if time had been available.

If I were going to do the research again, I would start at the beginning of the school year in September. The majority of the interviews took place in April and May, which is an extremely busy time for teachers. Many schools turned down the opportunity to be involved because of the timing, and I believe they would have offered valuable information to this investigation. In addition, many principals were very protective of their teachers' time, which I could fully appreciate and understand. If the research had commenced earlier in the school year, perhaps a more cooperative attitude by the principals would have been present.

Many teachers commented that the interview process was appreciated because it was non-threatening and they knew that their names and schools would be kept confidential. This permitted them to speak their minds and offer valuable information. It is also the researcher's belief that teachers want to know that someone is interested in what they are doing. And, because I too was a teacher, one of their peers, teachers were honest, very open and more apt to share their true feelings throughout the interview process than with a university scholar or other district personnel. During one such incident a teacher thought I was an administrator or director of some kind. She was nervous and very much on guard until I explained that I too was a teacher and knew of the challenges she faced. Although I list this under "limitations," I believe that my role of "teacher-as-researcher" was an asset rather than a liability in the overall research process.

Also, teachers and principals were asked to offer their perceptions of how *they* felt students and community receptiveness and motivation were towards Spanish instruction. Although these data were informative and valuable, it would have been more valuable if both students and parents in the community could have been interviewed in order to glean how they actually felt towards the assessment, the instruction and Spanish teaching in general. Again, time constraints and the need to limit the parameters of this research project played a major role in the data collection process.

Lastly, many people asked why I didn't just mail out surveys *en masse* to the schools. While there was the possibility of gathering more quantitative data within a survey, I opted to conduct one-on-one interviews instead. The one-on-one interviews I had with the teachers, principals, media specialists and other district and state personnel were far more personal and had more in-depth qualitative information because I had spent personal and valuable time with them.

IV. Recommendations

One of the last goals of this study was to share information with administrators and teachers to emphasize the importance of foreign language continuation in the district. When I commenced this research project, the assistant superintendent in charge of curriculum asked me to share the results with her upon completion of my thesis. And as I was trying to collect current data from the Center for Applied Linguistics, Nancy Rhodes requested a copy of my work and asked me to write a summary paper for CAL. The following recommendations will be presented to personnel who will be making adjustments, schedule changes, curricula updates, etc. with regards to Spanish instruction in the elementary schools at MPS.

A. Parent Volunteer Program

Because many teachers in the district rated themselves as having low proficiency in Spanish, one of the best ways to alleviate the stress felt by many is to develop a community resource program involving native speakers of Spanish or other qualified

second language speakers from the community. In the Madison School District of Phoenix, Arizona, a parent volunteer program was established for the 5th and 6th grade classes. An eighth-grade Spanish teacher from the Madison District wrote twenty Spanish lessons for the 5th and 6th grade students. Then, parent volunteers were recruited through the school newspaper and parent-teacher association. They were trained on lesson presentation by the Spanish teacher and Miriam Acquafredda, who had previously volunteered to teach Spanish in her child's classroom. The program created an opportunity for friendships and parental involvement (Acquafredda 1993). MPS has a rich resource of native speakers in the community that would greatly add to curriculum in the schools as did the example above. Each school should seek out volunteers who could be screened, trained and asked to assist the teacher while she teaches Spanish. This would build the confidence of the teacher and also develop a bond with the community that would be beneficial to the student as well. And with the support from the ACL2, native speakers of Spanish will receive the necessary training to be partners with the classroom teacher.

B. Language Proficiency Outcomes

As discussed under Chapter Four, Research Question #3, which dealt with the curricular changes in Mesa Public Schools, a discovery was made that teachers are spending perhaps less than the expected time required to teach a foreign language, as stated by experts in the field of foreign language (Rosenbusch, 1995b; Curtain & Pesola, 1994, Met, 1990). For third graders in Mesa, a minimum of 60 minutes of foreign language instruction is expected, as noted by the MPS Curriculum Guide. In many of the classes, it was found that a wide range of choices, from five to ten minutes up to one hour per week, was assigned to Spanish instruction. At the Mesa Board Meeting in February, 1997, there was a discussion of children's lack of ability to respond to simple questions in Spanish. It is the belief of the researcher that a minimum of 60 minutes as required by the district should be more of the standard rather than a discretionary option. Curtain & Pesola (1994) explain:

> In this chapter, various program models and staffing options have been presented. School Districts and program planners must choose among them

> according to the language proficiency outcomes they desire and the budgetary and staffing circumstances in which they find themselves. Underlying every program and model description is the fact that language proficiency outcomes are directly proportional to the amount of time spent by students in meaningful communication in the target language. The more time students spend working communicatively with the target language, under the guidance of a skilled and fluent teacher, the greater will be the level of language proficiency that they acquire. Planners should seek to design the best possible program in terms of language proficiency that they are able to implement (47).

The key words, *language proficiency outcomes*, are directly tied to the amount of time spent by students under the direction of a skilled and fluent teacher, which leads us to the next recommendation.

C. Teacher Inservice Training

As Rosenbusch (1991) so clearly stated, no program would be able to function without well-prepared and qualified teachers. This is perhaps the greatest need for the FLES program and teachers in Mesa. How do you train more than 2,000 teachers at over 48 elementary schools? It is the researcher's belief that until it becomes a state requirement, the motivation to attend classes or seek training will not occur due to the issues of time, money, and interest. The researcher proposes selecting two teachers plus an administrator from each school and offering inservice training developed either by the State, the universities, or the consultants who are qualified to teach a foreign language to train the teachers and administrators. These individuals would then return to their schools and train the other teachers. It would seem logical that the teachers or the administrator be at least an average speaker of Spanish or above. It would not be as necessary for the principal to be fluent because his role would be to advocate the training of the staff.

In October of 1996, a group of faculty members from ASU and NAU met to discuss how universities could help prepare educators as foreign language teachers. Three ideas were generated: FLES Endorsement, NS-FLES (training for native speakers with no prior educational experience), and LTCT (Language training for classroom teachers). Course work and the development of training for teachers would be beneficial for establishing higher proficiency levels among the schools. And the Department of Modern

Languages at Northern Arizona University in Flagstaff offers a summer Spanish Immersion Program for ten weeks that might offer help in training personnel. The state organization, AZLA (Arizona Language Association), with its FLES committee, are preparing to offer support to educators by creating workshops, teacher training, and consulting for school districts in the state who might need assistance in planning FLES instruction. Their goal is to teach how districts can integrate FLES instruction into the regular curriculum in order to minimize costs and train existing staff. And with the training of NSs, this should encourage more Spanish instruction in the classroom and offer the necessary support that teachers have needed (Overall, 1997).

D. Foreign Language Priorities and Assessments

Firstly, with the constant cuts to school budgets and the lack of funding for education in general, foreign language education is sometimes less of a priority than other core areas like reading, writing, mathematics, science, etc. According to Garnett, (1996) one of the solutions is what could be called the "Supply and Demand" of foreign language:

> Let us create an interest in second language learning/acquisition so strong and pervasive that the community itself will demand its inclusion in the regular academic program for the young learners... We need to find advocates who are on the other side of the argument, the young learners themselves! We need to stimulate the natural interest and enthusiasm, the innate love of adventure and thirst for that which is novel, new, and different, of the young student. We need to get them to be our advocates of FLES*...School administrators, parents, and citizens listen to the arguments of the young who are showing motivation in learning. In a capitalistic society the old axiom of "Supply and Demand" is still a reality. Let us help the youngster create the *demand* and we professional educators answer with the *supply* (121).

Overall (1997) clarifies that funding is needed for all areas in education and not just for foreign language education. Foreign language education does not supersede other curriculum areas, but it needs to become a permanent part of the curriculum like reading, science, mathematics, etc., so that it is part of the general budget. It has been her experience that if separate funding is given to foreign language instruction, the program lasts only as long as the funding does.

Hopkins (1992) suggests that to make sure that foreign language acquisition is made an integral part of the school curriculum and not just an afterthought, a campaign promoting languages needs to occur in the United States and in every school district and individual school across the nation. Hopkins states:

> We need a national campaign--a campaign to influence and encourage acceptance of a value in our belief system that is present, but that is not yet widely or deeply enough held. There are many recent examples of how beliefs in our country have changed when a message was clearly articulated. With much time and effort, campaigns like that have been successful, e.g., the antismoking (sic) campaign, using safety belts in our cars, AIDS awareness, lowering cholesterol levels in our diet. Has there ever been a large-scale print or TV campaign of public service messages to promote belief in the utility of foreign language acquisition? (153).

One of the easiest ways to let people know about the importance of foreign language instruction is to send test results home and/or place it as a permanent section on the report card. Parents need to know that Spanish is truly a part of our curriculum. An official printout of the Spanish test results should be sent to each school so teachers are aware of its importance, just as printouts are sent about successes in Math and Reading.

Secondly, formal assessments are given only in the third grade. Why not create tests for all the grades, so progress can be monitored in the same manner as reading cards which are passed from each grade level to the next. The test can directly cover the goals and expectations at each grade level so that the weight of the instruction is spread across the grade levels instead of just in the third grade, where Spanish accountability and instruction are expected. A student assessment is available in the second grade unit, known as *Changes Spanish Supplement* (1992). However, it is for teacher evaluation only and is not officially reported as is the third grade assessment. The researcher believes that if assessments were required at every grade level, this would encourage teachers to ask for more training. More training requests to the district would hopefully motivate the district to plan more ways to train teachers. And this in turn would create opportunities to work with the universities to develop classes that would appropriately and specifically train teachers to teach Spanish at their grade level. It is also the recommendation of the researcher that students enrolled at the university in Elementary Education be required to take at least two

semesters or more of Spanish classes and one practical methodology class so that they would enter the work force better prepared to assist in the training of veteran educators who possessed limited language experiences. Granted, two semesters of Spanish would not make them proficient, but it's a start in the right direction.

In conclusion, foreign language is a priority in our nation, in Arizona, and in Mesa. We need to be prepared by receiving training and motivating our best resource--the children--that foreign language skills are a tool for learning just as are math and reading. With these tools we can construct a promising future for the children as well as the entire country. As Hopkins (1992) says:

> And just as no single tool can construct anything very elaborate, foreign language skills have to be used in tandem with other skills---with math, science, business, and other native-language communication skills. Isn't this really just common sense? The integration of foreign language study with the other skills and other disciplines taught in our grade schools, our high schools and our universities: this is the way to give each student the widest range of opportunities, the greatest chance for success (153-154).

NOTES

1. The year of the mandate is different depending on the source. In a memorandum from the State Superintendent of Public Instruction to school district superintendents dated February 26, 1992, she states: "I know of the interest all of you share in the foreign language mandate first discussed and voted into rule in 1990." However, in an article by V. Vigil of Northern Arizona University, Vigil states "In December 1988, the Arizona State Board of Education passed mandate R7-2-301 requiring that all elementary schools in Arizona initiate a foreign language program in at least one grade level by the commencement of the 1991-1992 school year. A 'grace period' extended implementation until 1993-1994." In a phone conference interview on June 5, 1997 with the Education Program Specialist, Bilingual Unit, Arizona Department of Education, he said the State Board approved the Foreign Language Mandate in November 1989. In newspaper articles by the *Mesa Tribune* (1991) and *Phoenix Gazette* (1991), they mention November 1989. Part of the challenge with getting an exact date is the fact that when the mandate was approved, passed and actually became a ruling, occurred on different dates. See States Minutes in Chapter One for a detailed clarification.

2. The following terms are used interchangeably and relate to FLES (Foreign Language in the Elementary Schools): *Foreign Language Instruction* (FLI) and *Foreign Language Education* (FLE).

3. For information about the other 14 counties, see individual plan sheets on file at the Arizona Department of Education.

4. At the end of the 1997 school year, there were thirteen elementary schools in the Gilbert District.

5. Informant E7 could not respond to this particular question because her colleague, who speaks Spanish, does all the Spanish instruction at their grade level in a departmentalized manner. Therefore, even though there were 28 teachers interviewed, only 27 responded to question 15.

6. The Art Master Piece Program, created by Mesa Public Schools, trains volunteers, sometimes parents of the students, to teach classes about famous artists and their works. Instead of teaching art, volunteers would be trained to teach Spanish to students.

7. The *Weekly Reader* is a newspaper for children that is printed in Spanish and English.

8. There were only five third grade teachers who had given the (1995) test, out of the twenty-eight randomly selected teachers. There was a response from each school except for School F in the interview process under the section of the teacher interview called "Third Grade Teachers Only." Informant D 5 had previously been a 1st grade teacher and could not respond to specific questions about the actual (1995) test when interviewed in the Spring of 1996 but did respond to the effect of the test as a third grade teacher during 1996.

9. Due to the fact that informants are anonymous in this research project, the use of the pronouns *he* or *she* have been deleted at times. The pronoun *they* is sometimes used instead of the gender pronouns.

REFERENCES

Acquafredda, M. (1993). *A parent volunteer program for the 5th and 6th grades to teach Spanish: the Phoenix experiment.* ERIC ED 372 596.

Andersson, T. (1969). *Foreign languages in the elementary school: A struggle against mediocrity.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Animals in our world Spanish supplement. (1992). Mesa, AZ: Mesa Public Schools.

Arizona Department of Education. (1994, Feb.). A report. *Arizona Public School Districts.*

Badía, A., Díaz V.T., & Gavilán, M. (1992). ¡Saludos! an innovative program developed by Broward County Public Schools in Florida. *Hispania*, 75,188-191.

Baranick, W. A. & Markham, P. L. (1986). Attitudes of elementary school principals toward foreign language instruction. *Foreign Language Annals*, 19, 481-489.

Basha, E. et al., (1988, Dec.). Elementary foreign language task force. *Report to the Arizona State Board of Education/Vocational Education.* Phoenix: Arizona Department of Education.

Benevento, J. (1985). *Issues and innovation in foreign language education.* Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Bishop, C.D. (1992, Feb.). *Foreign language requirement.* A memorandum to school district superintendents.

Changes Spanish Supplement. (1992). Mesa, AZ: Mesa Public Schools.

Clyne, M. (1991). *Community languages, The Australian experience.* Cambridge, England: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.

Commissioner of Official Languages. (1994). *Annual report 1993.* Ottawa, Canada: Minister of Supply and Services Canada.

Cooper, R.L. (1989). *Language planning and social change.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Count Down Spanish Supplement.. (1994). Teacher booklet. Mesa, AZ: Mesa Public Schools.

Cribari, S. (1993, June). FLES*--It's elementary, my dear Watson!" *Collabore*, 7.3, 1-3.

Curtain, H. (1991). Methods in elementary school foreign language teaching. *Foreign Language Annals*, 24 (4), 323-329.

Curtain, H. & Pesola, C. (1994). *Languages and children: Making the match.* White Plains, NY: Longman.

Crystal, D. (1987). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language. Language planning.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Dolson, D. P. (1984). *Studies in immersion education.* Sacramento: State Department of Education.

Donato, R. & Antonek, J. L. (1994). A multiple perspectives analysis of a Japanese FLES program. *Foreign Language Annals,* 27 (3), 365-378.

Donato, R. & Terry, R.M. (1995). *Foreign language learning: The Journey of a lifetime.* Lincolnwood: National Textbook Company.

Donoghue, M. (1968). *Foreign languages and the elementary school child.* Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown.

Draper, J.B. & Scebold, C.E. (Eds.). (1996). Foreign language standards celebrated in Anaheim. *ACTFL Newsletter.* 8 (2), 3-24.

Duzak, W. (1994). *Natural study vs. textbook : Young students find Spanish fun.* Tennessean Newspaper.(n. p.)

Executive Summary. (1995). *National standards in foreign language education a collaborative project of ACTFL, AATF, AATG, & AATSP.* Yonkers, New York: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Inc.

Fishman, J. A. (1971). The sociology of language: an interdisciplinary social science approach to language in society. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Advances in the Sociology of Language* (pp. 217-404). The Hague: Mouton.

Fishman, J. A. (1985). Macrosociolinguistics and the sociology of language in the early eighties. *Annual Review of Sociology,* II, 113-27.

Garfinkel, A. & Tabor, K. E. (1991). Elementary school foreign languages and English reading achievement: A new view of the relationship. *Foreign Language Annals* , 24 (5), 375-82.

Garnett, N. A. (1996). Children as FLES* advocates. *Hispania,* 79, 121-123.

Grittner, F. M. (1969). *Teaching foreign languages.* New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

Hakuta, K. (1986). *What research says about bilingual education.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the national association for bilingual education, Chicago, 1-5 April (ERIC ED 270 986).

Hamayan, E. (1986). The need for foreign language competence in the United States. *Eric Digest..* Washington, D.C (ED 276 304).

Heining-Boynton, A. L. (1990). Using FLES history to plan for the present and future. *Foreign Language Annals*, 23, 503-09.

Heining-Boynton, A. (1991). The FLES program evaluation inventory (FPEI). *Foreign Language Annals*, 24, 193-202.

Hopkins, W. (1992). The acquisition of foreign languages as a national priority for America. *Foreign Language Annals*, 25, 147-154.

Ingram, D. E. (1994). Language policy in Australia in the 1990s. In R. D. Lambert, (Ed.), *Language Planning Around the World: Contexts and Systemic Change*. (n.p.). Washington, D. C.: The National Foreign Language Center at the Johns Hopkins University.

Jacobsen, D. (Aug. 1989). Early foreign language training raises test scores. *Curriculum Product News, Preview '90 Issue*, 2, (4), (n.p.)

Jordan, L. (Ed.). (1997, Feb.). Foreign language advisers present report. *MesAgenda*, 25 (25), 2-3.

Kelley, L. G. (1969). *25 centuries of language teaching*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.

Kennedy, D.F., Barr-Harrison, P., & Wilmeth, M.G. (1994). *Exploring languages. A complete introduction for foreign language students*. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook.

Kloss, H. (1969). *Research possibilities on group bilingualism: A report*. Quebec: International Center for Research on Bilingualism.

Lubiner, E.D. (1992). *Learning about languages (a comprehensive FLEX activity book)*. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Lipton, G. C. (1990). A look back . . . a look ahead. *Hispania*, 73, 255-258.

Lipton, G. C. (1994). FLES* programs today: Options and opportunities. *The French Review*, 68, 1-16.

Marcos, K. (1996, June). Foreign language exploratory programs: Introduction to language learning. *ERIC Digest* . ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages & Linguistics. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics (EDO-FL-96-08).

Martin-Bletsas, J. (1992). *The teaching of modern foreign languages in primary and secondary education in the European community*. Brussels, Belgium: EURYDICE European Unit.

McArthur, T. (Ed.). (1992). *The Oxford companion to the English language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McLaughlin, B. (1977). Second language acquisition in children. *Psychological Bulletin*, 84, 438-459.

Met, M. (1987, March 17). (n. t.) Paper presented at the Second Language Acquisition by Children Conference. Raleigh, NC.

Met, M. (1990). Elementary school foreign language instruction: Priorities for the 1990s. *Foreign Language Annals*, 23, 433-443.

Met, M. (1991). *Elementary school foreign languages: What research can and cannot tell us*. In E. S. Silber. (Ed.), *Critical Issues in Foreign Language Instruction* (pp. 63-79). New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Minutes. (1961-1997). State Board of Education and State Board of Vocational Education/Arizona State Board of Education.

Omaggio, H. A. (1993). *Teaching language in context*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Overall, P.M. (Fall, 1996-1997). Consortium for quality second language instruction for kids (CL2) piloted in Tucson. *AZLA News*, 12 (2), 1-14.

Overall, P.M. (1996, Dec.). A memo to the Arizona Board of Education. *AZLA-FLES*.

Overall, P. M. (1997, July). Foreign language instruction in our schools. *Raising Arizona Kids*, 42-43.

Overall, P.M. (1997, Sept.). *Arizona Council on Second Language Instruction (ACL2)*. A news update.

Peck, B. (1993, September). The language explosion: Europe starts it early. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 91-92.

Postero, J. P. (1993). The politic of change: implementation of FLEX in the public schools of Gilbert, Arizona. *Hispania*, 76, 621-626.

Rafferty, E. (1986). *Second language study and basic skills in Louisiana*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana Dept. of Education.

Rhodes, N.C. & Oxford, R. L. (1987). *A national profile of foreign language instruction at the elementary and secondary school levels* (two volumes). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Rhodes,N. C. & Oxford, R.L. (1988). Foreign languages in elementary and secondary schools: Results of a national survey. *Foreign Language Annals*, 21, 51-69.

Rhodes, N.C. & Branaman, L. (1996, Sept.). National K-12 foreign language survey. *ERIC/CLL News Bulletin*. 20.1, 4-5.

Rosenbusch, M. H. (1995a). Language learners in the elementary school: Investing in the future. In R. Donato & R. Terry (Eds.), *Foreign language learning, the journey of a lifetime* (pp. 1-36). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook.

Rosenbusch, M. H. (1995b, June). Guidelines for starting an elementary school foreign language program. *ERIC Digest*, (ED)-FL-95-09).

Rosenbusch, M. H. (1991). Elementary school foreign language: The establishment and maintenance of strong programs. *Foreign Language Annals*, 24, 297-314.

Schinke-Llano, L. (1985). *Foreign language in the elementary school: State of the Art.* New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Schrum, J. L. & E. W. Gilsan. (1994). *Teacher's handbook. contextualized language instruction.* Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Short, S. (1995, Tues. May 23). Foreign languages: State education chief hails Milan program as 'exemplary'. *The Mirror-Exchange*. Milan, Tennessee, 10.

State Board of Education. (1989). *Foreign language in the elementary school.* R7-2-301.02. Arizona State Board of Education.

Stephens, D. (1989). Amigos: A television series for young children. *Hispania*, 72, 1065-1070.

Thompson, L., Richardson, G., Wang, L., & Rhodes, N. (1988). *The development of the FLES test--Spanish.* Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Vigil, V. (1993). Arizona's elementary foreign language mandate, Phase I: Now that we have it, what shall we do? *Foreign Language Annals*, 26, 535-541.

Wang, L., Richardson, G., & Rhodes, N. (1988). *The CLEAR oral proficiency exam (COPE).* Project Report Addendum: Clinical Testing and Validity and Dimensionality Studies. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Wardhaugh, R. (1992). *An introduction to sociolinguistics: Language planning* (pp. 346-371). Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers.

Weinstein, B. (1980). Language planning in francophone Africa. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 4.1, 55-77.

Weinstein, B. (Ed.). (1990). *Language policy and political development.* Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Why FLES*? Brochure available from AATF, 57 E. Aromony Ave., Champaign, IL 61820.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

Questionnaire for teachers

School _____ Teacher # _____

Demographic Information

Sex: M_____ F_____ Age: (optional) _____

Degrees held: B.S.___ B.A. ___ M. A. ____ Ed. D. ___Ph. D. ____ Other_____

Area(s) of Specialization:_____

Certification(s) held:_____

Ethnicity: Anglo_____ Mexican American_____
African American _____ Polynesian_____
Native American_____ Asian American_____
Other_____

Foreign languages spoken: _____

Study abroad:_____

****

Language Background Information

1) How long have you been teaching?____ years. How many years have you been teaching at _____ School? _____years.

2) Do you speak Spanish? Yes _____ No_____

Other foreign languages?_____

3) How would you describe your Spanish proficiency?

Native Speaker_____ Average Speaker_____

Minimal Level Speaker ____

Non Native Speaker_____ Other_____

4) Since the passage of the mandate, have you taken any steps to enhance your foreign language skills? Yes _____ No _____ If yes, how?

Spanish Language Classes _____ At a Community College____ University_____
International Programs_____ Workshops_____
Travel abroad_____ Residence in another country_____ Other_____

5) Did you receive foreign language instruction as a child in the elementary school? Y_____ N_____ If yes, please explain the process used to teach the language.

6) Did you have foreign language instruction at the junior and/or high school level?
Y____ N____ Junior High School_____ High School _____ Both_____

Spanish Instruction in the Classroom

7) How often do you teach Spanish during the week? Once____ Twice_____

Daily_____ Other_____ For how many minutes? _____

8) What resources have been made available from the District to you as an educator of Spanish?
books_____ videos_____ teaching aids_____
visual aids_____ audio equipment_____ other_____

9) What types of evaluation do you use to assess the acquisition of Spanish?

district test_____ district booklet_____ games_____
teacher made quizzes_____ rubrics_____other_____

10) Please describe the ideal teaching situation for Spanish.

Foreign language specialist who teaches Spanish to your students._____
One teacher per grade level that teaches Spanish to your students._____
School-wide training of all teachers_____
Other_____

11) Has your Spanish improved since using the District's video program?
Y___ N___
Do you participate with the students by writing in the student booklet, practicing the vocabulary, singing the songs, etc. while watching the video program? Y___ N_____ If no,_____ describe your usual activities:
Grade papers_____ Read _____ Other_____

12) What else, if anything, do you use other than the District video tape, booklets, overlays, and flash cards when teaching Spanish during the week?

Games_____Songs_____ Drill and practice_____
Literature_____ Use students who speak Spanish_____
Other_____

13) When you don't know a word or need help with Spanish, to what or to whom do you turn to as a coping skill if you need immediate instruction?

Students_____ Teachers_____ Resource Audio tapes_____
Dictionary_____ Teacher Resource Manuals_____Other_____

Teacher Perceptions of Spanish Instruction

14) Do you think teaching Spanish is important? Y ___ N_____ If yes, why? If no, why not?_____

15) What motivates you to use Spanish in the classroom? Rank your answers in order of importance with 1 being the most motivational.

It's a State mandate_____
District influence_____
It's part of the Curriculum _____
Large Hispanic population_____
School focus_____
Colleagues _____
Personal interest_____
Other_____

16) How receptive are you and your colleagues, your school and your community to the teaching of Spanish?
Rate on a scale from 1 being the lowest to 5 being the highest.
Yourself_____ Colleagues _____ Your school?_____
Parents_____ Your community?_____

17) If there had been no mandate and you had the choice, to teach Spanish or not, what would you have chosen and why?
Teach Spanish_____ Not teach Spanish_____Why?_____

18)If there had been an option to teach another foreign language, what language would you have preferred? French_____ German_____ Japanese_____
Other_____

Program Assessment

19) If you use the District Spanish Program created by Mesa Public Schools and Ed. TV, how would you rate its success in teaching Spanish to your students?
Rate it on a scale from 1 being the lowest to 5 being the highest. _____

Please explain your rating_____
20) Have you used other video programs to teach Spanish? Y___ N____ If yes, what are they?
"Amigos"_____ "Saludos"_____ Others_____

21) Would you prefer the District Spanish Program or another type of program?
District _____ Other_____

22) Do you think that cultural information should be a part of the District Spanish Program? Y_____ N_____ Please explain your response.
_____

23) In your opinion, please describe how your students feel about the District Spanish Program? Like it_____ Boring_____ Fun_____ Interesting_____
Can't wait to see it_____ Other_____

24) If you had created the video program, what would you have added or deleted to make it fit your mind set of what a Spanish video program should be like ? Less/More songs_____ Less/More vocabulary_____ Less/More cultural information_____ Less/More Spanish phrases_____ Other_____

Teacher Training

25) What type of training have you had to assist you in teaching Spanish? Classes_____Workshops_____ Travel Abroad_____ Residence in another country_____Other training or experiences_____ None_____

26) What has stopped you from taking classes? Time_____ Money_____ Availability_____ Language Level of class (too high/low)_____ Interest_____ Not accountable to anyone_____Other_____

27) If you could receive instructional support from the district and/or state, what would you elect regarding the instruction of Spanish at your school? Please rank your answers starting with one being the most important.

School-wide training from the district_____ Attendance at workshops and/or classes_____ Additional teaching materials_____ Allocated budget for the purchase of Spanish materials_____ Other_____

28) If you could specify what type of training you would receive, what would you choose? Please rank your answers starting with one being the most important. Teaching Methods (TPR, NA, Suggestopedia etc.) _____ Grammar and Pronunciation_____ Theories of Language Learning_____ Curriculum Design_____ Games and Songs_____ Drill and Practice Techniques_____ Other_____

Suggestions for the Researcher

29) If you were the researcher investigating Spanish language implementation in Mesa since the passage of the foreign language mandate, what questions would you ask?

_____

30) How would you describe this interview process? positive_____ informative_____ difficult_____ resourceful_____ Other_____ Please explain your answer:_____

Third Grade Teachers Only

31) What affect did the Spanish test have on instruction in your classroom?

32) How did you feel about the Spanish test results that were sent to your school in the Spring of 1995?

33) Were the results shared with parents? Y_____ N_____

34) If you had been given the option to give the test or not, what would your decision be? Yes, give the test_____ No _____ Please explain._____

35) What was the reaction of your students to the test?

36) Did you receive training and instruction before giving the test?
Y___N____Explain your answer.

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PRINCIPALS

Questionnaire for Principals

School _____ Principal # _____

Demographic Information

Sex: M_____ F_____ Age: (optional) _____

Degrees held: B.S.___ B.A.___ M.A.___ Ed. D.___ Ph.D.___ Other_____

Area(s) of Specialization:_____

Certification(s) held:_____

Ethnicity: Anglo_____ Mexican American_____
African American _____ Polynesian_____
Native American_____ Asian American_____
Other_____

Foreign languages spoken: _____

Study abroad:_____

****

1) Since the passage of the Arizona Elementary Foreign Language Mandate, what effects has it had on the instruction of Spanish in your school?

2) How often is Spanish taught to the students during the week? Once _____ Twice_____ Daily_____ Other_____ For how many minutes?_____

3) Who teaches Spanish in your school? One teacher per grade level?_____ All teachers? _____ Other_____

What criteria are used in the selection of Spanish teachers?
_____

4) Do you think Spanish should be taught in the elementary schools? If yes, why?___ If no, why not? _____

5) What are the perceptions of the following groups towards the instruction of Spanish? Teachers? _____ Students? _____ Parents?_____ Community?_____

6) What resources and materials are available in your library and school to assist the teachers with their Spanish instruction? Children's books_____ Spanish teaching manuals_____ Videos_____ Computer software_____ Others_____

7) What directives and guidelines have been made available to you from the district regarding your administrative responsibilities towards Spanish instruction since the mandate?

Memos_____ Notification of language classes_____ Instructional resource catalogs_____ Changes in curriculum_____ Assessment strategies_____ Other_____

8) Do you consider the District's Spanish Video Program to be successful in the teaching of Spanish to your students? Yes_____ No_____ Why or why not?_____

9) What would be the ideal teaching situation for foreign language instruction at your school?

Foreign language specialist who teaches Spanish to the students._____
One teacher per grade level that teaches Spanish to the students._____
School-wide training for all teachers_____
Other_____

10) Is there a budget allocated for purchasing language instructional materials at your school? If yes, please explain._____ If no, discuss why not._____

11) If you were the researcher, what questions would you ask the teachers as they integrate Spanish into the curriculum?

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR DIRECTOR OF SCIENCE AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

Questionnaire for Director of Science and Social Sciences

Administrator # _____

Demographic Information

Sex: M___ F___ Age: (optional) _____

Degrees held: B.S.___ B.A.___ M.A.___ Ed. D.___ Ph.D.___ Other_____

Area(s) of Specialization:_____
Certification(s) held:_____

Ethnicity:
Anglo_____ Mexican American_____
African American _____ Polynesian_____
Native American_____ Asian American_____
Other_____

Foreign languages spoken: _____

Study
abroad:_____

****

1) Summarize the history and purpose of the Arizona Elementary Foreign Language Mandate.

2) Prior to the mandate, how was Spanish or other foreign languages perceived by the district?
Was foreign language an integral part of the students' curriculum?

3) Explain the results of the Spanish Test given to third graders in the Spring of 1995.

a. How many schools were involved in the testing process? _____out of _____ schools in the district. Number of students? ____ out _____ total
b. The average score was 92% for the district. What does this percentage tell us?
c. Due to the change in the ASAP test to fourth grade, will this same test be used even though the curriculum is being changed to the program called "Saludos"?

4) What are Mesa Public School's current goals for the future instruction of Spanish?_____ Foreign languages in general?_____
a. What is the philosophy of teaching foreign language in the district?

b. What are the district's needs as far as the implementation of the state's standards for teaching foreign languages?

6) What are the pros and cons of the Arizona Language Mandate on this district? Other Districts? Statewide?

7) What kind of follow-up is being done in the district with regard to the MPS goals and objectives made in December 11, 1990? Have these been revised? Are they sent to the schools for the teachers to see?

8) What training is being offered or is available to teachers who don't speak Spanish?

9) If you could start over and redo the language planning for Mesa Public Schools, what changes would you implement? What strategies have been successful? Unsuccessful?

10) Next year in fourth grade, how will the change in curriculum from the district made Spanish video program to "Saludos" affect the scope and sequence started in grades one through three?

11) Please describe the most ideal teaching situation for foreign language instruction.

Foreign language specialist who teaches Spanish to the students_____
One teacher per grade level that teaches Spanish to the students_____
School-wide training of all teachers_____
Other_____

12) Did you receive foreign language instruction as a child in the elementary school?

Y_____ N_____ If yes, please explain the process used to teach the language.

13) If you were the researcher, what questions would you ask the teachers who are integrating Spanish into the curriculum?

APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR EDUCATION PROGRAM SPECIALIST

Questionnaire for the Education Program Specialist, Bilingual Unit, Arizona Department of Education

Demographic Information

Informant #_____

Sex: M___ F___ Age: (optional) _____

Degrees held: B.S. ___ B.A.___ M.A.___ Ed. D.____ Ph.D.___ Other_____

Area(s) of Specialization:_____

Certification(s) held:_____

Ethnicity: Anglo_____ Mexican American_____
African American _____ Polynesian_____
Native American_____ Asian American_____
Other_____

Foreign languages spoken: _____

Study abroad:_____

What is your official role and job description at the AZ Dept. of Education?
_____

****

1) Can you summarize the history and purpose of the Arizona Elementary Foreign Language Mandate?

2) What steps were taken to develop language planning in the State?

3) Whom did the State turn to as consultants in order to devise the mandate?
Task Force_____ Language teachers_____ Legislators_____ Community Resources_____ Other_____

4) Prior to the mandate, what role did Spanish and foreign languages in the elementary schools have in the state of Arizona?

5) How many districts chose Spanish? _____ out of total # of Districts_____ a. Other languages chosen _____
b. What were the criteria used in the language selection in each district?
c. Do you have documentation to show the choices made by the various school districts in Arizona?

6) What options do school districts have regarding teacher training in foreign languages?
Are language specialists in each school a possible option when a qualified teacher is unavailable? Y_____ N_____ Explain.

7) What are the available resources such as teaching materials that would improve curriculum development offered by the State?

8) What effect has the Arizona Language Mandate had on the State of Arizona regarding the implementation of the mandate?

9) If you could reimplement the Arizona Mandate in the elementary schools, what changes would you propose?

10) What are your future expectations for the instruction of foreign languages in the State?

11) Are you aware of the Mesa Public Schools' Spanish program? Y___ N___. If yes, what is your assessment of this particular district?

12) Please share what other school districts are doing since the passage of the mandate. What is the most common type of elementary FLES program in the State?

FLEX_____ Sequential FLEX_____ Partial Immersion _____ Total Immersion_____
Other_____

13) Please describe the most ideal teaching situation for foreign language instruction.

Foreign language specialist who teaches Spanish to the students_____
One teacher per grade level that teaches Spanish to the students_____
School-wide training of all teachers_____
Other_____

14) If you were the researcher, what questions would you ask the teachers as they integrate Spanish into the curriculum?

APPENDIX E

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR RESOURCE TEACHER

Questionnaire for the Resource Teacher for Mesa Public Schools

Demographic Information
Informant #_____
Sex: M___ F___ Age: (optional) _____

Degrees held: B.S.___ B.A.___ M.A.___ Ed. D.____ Ph.D.____ Other_____
Area(s) of
Specialization:_____Certification(s)
held:_____

Ethnicity: Anglo_____ Mexican American_____
African American _____ Polynesian_____
Native American_____ Asian American_____
Other_____

Foreign languages spoken: _____

Study abroad:_____

What is your official role and job description for MPS? _____

****

1) Describe your assignment here at Mesa Public Schools.

2) What effect did the Arizona Foreign Language Mandate have on your job?

3) Please describe how you created a program to implement the teaching of Spanish into the District.

4) If you could make any changes in the test what would they be?_____

5) What changes would you implement in the teaching materials?_____

6) In your opinion, why should a foreign language be taught in the Elementary Schools?

7) What effect will the "Saludos" program have on learning Spanish in the 4th grade after several years of a consistent scope and sequence program used in the 1st-3rd grade?

8) How do you foresee the future of foreign language instruction in Mesa?

APPENDIX F

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MEDIA SPECIALISTS

Questionnaire for Media Specialists

Demographic Information

School:_____ Teacher # :_____

Sex: M___ F____ Age: (optional) _____

Degrees held: B.S.___ B.A.___ M.A.___ Ed. D.___ Ph.D.___ Other_____
Area(s) of Specialization:_____

Certification(s) held:_____

Ethnicity: Anglo_____ Mexican American_____
African American _____ Polynesian_____
Native American_____ Asian American_____
Other_____

Foreign languages spoken: _____

Study abroad:_____

****

1) What is your official role and job description for MPS?_____

2) Please describe the materials and resources in your library that help foster Spanish language development.

children's books _____ Spanish teaching manuals _____
videos_____ computer software_____
others_____

3) Is the purchase of foreign language materials part of your budget? Y___ N ___

4) What would you order to enhance foreign language instruction at your school?

Bilingual books_____ Spanish books_____ Picture books in Spanish_____
Teacher resource manuals_____ Audio tapes _____ Other_____

5) Are the students at your school using the Spanish books consistently? Y___ N____
Please explain the frequency of use. Hardly ever_____
Once in awhile _____Frequently _____ Other_____

6) What types of Spanish books seem to be the most frequently read at your school?
Bilingual _____ Spanish only_____ Picture books _____
Nonfiction Spanish _____ Chapter books_____ Other_____

7) Is there a school policy for the purchasing of foreign language materials? Y___N___

8) Has the purchase of materials been affected in any way by the English Only Proposition? Y_____ N_____ If so, explain your response._____

9) Do teachers at your school request books and foreign language materials from you as the media specialist in order to teach Spanish to their students? Y_____ N_____.

If yes, what requests have been made in the past years since the mandate?

_____

10) Do you think teaching Spanish is important here at your school? Y___ N___ Please explain your response. _____

11) If you were the researcher, what questions would you ask the teachers who are integrating Spanish into the curriculum?

APPENDIX G

VERBAL SCRIPT FOR RECRUITMENT OF SUBJECTS

Verbal Script for recruitment of subjects

I am a graduate student under the direction of Professor Letticia Galindo in the Department of Languages and Literatures at Arizona State University. I am conducting a research study to collect data from elementary teachers, principals, administrators, and state officials in order to discover the curricular changes due to the passage of the Arizona Elementary Foreign Language Mandate of 1989.

I am recruiting subjects to identify the successful resources and materials used in the teaching of Spanish by asking a series of questions during an audio taped interview which will take approximately 20 to 30 minutes. The audio-cassette will be kept by the researcher for future reference in evaluating the mandate's outcomes in Mesa Public Schools.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you choose not to participate, it will not affect you in any way. The results of the research may be published, but your name will not be used.

If you have any questions concerning the research study, please call me at Adams School, 833-6317 or contact Professor Galindo at A.S.U, 965-4563.

APPENDIX H

LETTER OF CONSENT FOR ADULTS

LETTER OF CONSENT FOR ADULTS

Dear _____:

I am a graduate student under the direction of Professor Letticia Galindo in the Department of Languages and Literatures at Arizona State University and a Third Grade teacher at Adams Elementary in Mesa. I am conducting a research study to collect data from elementary teachers, principals, administrators and state officials in order to discover what changes have occurred in the curriculum due to the passage of the Arizona Elementary Foreign Language Mandate of 1990.

Your participation will involve an audio-taped interview about curriculum changes and the effects of the mandate. The interview will last approximately 20 to 30 minutes. Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you choose not to participate, or to withdraw from the study at any time, it will not affect you in any way. The results of the research study may be published, but your name will not be used.

Although there may be no direct benefit to you, the possible benefit of your participation is that you will provide valuable information for the establishment of future foreign language instruction and programs.

If you have any questions concerning the research study, or participation in this study, please call me at Adams School, (602) 833-6317 or my graduate advisor, Professor Galindo at A.S.U., (602) 965-4563.

Sincerely,

Lorraine Mills

* * * * * *

I give consent to participate in the above study. I give permission to Lorraine Mills to keep the audio tapes for future reference in evaluating the mandate's outcomes in Mesa Public Schools. Yes_____ No_____

_____ _____

Signature Date

If you have any questions about your rights as a subject/participant in this research, or if you feel you have been placed at risk, you can contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board, through Carol Jablonski, at (602) 965-6788.

APPENDIX 1

RECRUITMENT LETTER FOR TEACHERS

May 1996

Dear Teachers,

I am currently seeking volunteer teachers interested in participating in a study of the curriculum changes as a result of the 1990 Arizona Elementary Foreign Language Mandate. I'm looking for volunteers who teach Spanish in the classroom. As well, I am very interested in learning from the media specialists what books and teaching materials you have access to in your school library. Please take a minute to read the attached letter.

As a teacher, I'm very aware of how busy everyone is at this time of the year. It's been challenging and to be honest, very humbling, being on the other side of the fence as a researcher. Please consider taking 20-30 minutes out of your schedule.

If you are interested, please call me at Adams School and/or send your response through inner school mail. I am willing to meet with you after school starting at 3:115 p.m. If you would prefer meeting with me at your home later in the evenings or on the weekends, that would be fine too. Your participation will be greatly appreciated and I look forward to learning from you.

Lorraine Mills
Third Grade Teacher
Adams School
833-6317
Fax # 890-2317

APPENDIX J

RECRUITMENT LETTER FOR PRINCIPALS

April 1996

Dear _____:

I am currently working on my M. A. thesis through A.S.U. and conducting research that investigates the effects of the Arizona Elementary Foreign Language Mandate of 1990 in order to discover the curriculum changes that have occurred within Mesa Public Schools. Your school was randomly selected to assist with the research.

In order to complete the data collection, I will need to interview at least six elementary principals and approximately 30 teachers. The interview consists of a questionnaire that will last approximately 20 to 30 minutes. The interview will be audio-taped if you give your consent. Your name will not be used but the results of the research study will be presented in group format. Your participation in the study is strictly voluntary.

I would like to interview you as the principal and four to six teachers at your school. If possible, please include in this group a third grade teacher (they gave the Third Grade Spanish Test in 1995 and possibly this year in 1996) and the media specialist. Therefore, please select volunteer teachers and give them the recruitment note and the letter of consent. If you are willing to participate, please send your response through inner school mail. Or you may leave a message by calling me at Adams School (833-6317) and/or sending a FAX. (890-2317)

As a teacher, I'm very aware of how busy everyone is at this time of the year. It's been challenging and to be honest, very humbling, being on the other side of the fence as a researcher. Please consider taking just 20-30 minutes out of your schedule. My goal is to complete the data collection in April and May. Thank you very much for your time and your consideration.

Sincerely,

Lorraine Mills

APPENDIX K

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR FAMILY LIAISON

Questionnaire for Family Liaison

School _____ Participant # _____

Demographic Information

Sex: M_____ F_____ Age: (optional) _____

Degrees held: B.S.___ B.A. ___ M. A. ____ Ed. D. ___Ph. D. ____ Other_____

Area(s) of Specialization:_____

Certification(s) held:_____

Ethnicity: Anglo_____ Mexican American_____
African American _____ Polynesian_____
Native American_____ Asian American_____
Other_____

Foreign languages spoken: _____

Study abroad:_____

****

1) What is your official role and job description for MPS?
_____

2) How long have you been a parent liaison at _____School?_____years

3) Please describe how your position was created?_____

4) How do you spend your time at _____School?
_____

5) Describe the classes that you teach?_____
   a. How often do they meet?

   b. To whom do you teach?

   c. What are the affects of this class on your community? School?

6) How do you interact with the community? Parents? Teachers? Students? Administrators?

7) Do you think the instruction of Spanish is in important? Y___ N____ Explain your answer _____

8) Do you speak Spanish? Y_____ N_____ Describe your proficiency level.
Native Speaker_____ Average Speaker_____ Minimal Level _____ Non Native____
Other_____

9) Explain your perception of the Arizona Foreign Language Mandate._____

10) Has your role as a parent liaison created a bond between the school and the Hispanic population of your community? Y_____ N_____

11) Do you meet with other parent liaisons from other schools? Y_____ N_____

12) What would you do differently next year as a parent liaison?_____

APPENDIX L

MESA PUBLIC SCHOOLS SPANISH TEST DESCRIPTION

The following description serves to explain the format of the Mesa Public Schools Third Grade Spanish Test created for assessment in 1995. The examples are **not** taken from the actual test but have been created by the researcher. English translations are not on the test but are given here so comprehension by the reader is possible.

Mesa Public Schools Third Grade Spanish Test

Animals

Students were asked to identify one animal when a particular phrase was given. There were eight rows with three different pictures of animals each with bubbles under each one. The student would hear for example: "El cochino es un animal de la granja". Un animal de la granja es el cochino."(The pig is a farm animal. A farm animal is the pig.) The student would then bubble in the picture of "el cochino". (the pig)

Example: "el cochino" (the pig), "la mariposa" (the butterfly), "el oso" (the bear)
◊ ◊ ◊

Numbers

Students were asked to identify a particular number when given a row of three numbers with bubbles under each one. There were six rows of three numbers shown numerically. The student would bubble under "doce" (12) when given the Spanish number.

Example: 15 17 12
◊ ◊ ◊

Colors

Students were asked to identify a particular color when given a row of three different colored squares. There were four rows of different colored squares. The students would bubble in the Spanish color spoken.

Example: "rosa" (pink) "gris" (gray) "morado" (purple)
◊ ◊ ◊

Weather

Students were asked to identify the type of weather indicated by three distinct pictures. Students were given a phrase that hinted to the season and the climate. There were four rows with three different pictures in each row. For example, students would choose between three pictures: 1) a picture showing a rainstorm, 2) a picture of a sunny day at the beach, and 3) a picture snowing in the winter Then the student would hear:

Example: "Está nevando en el invierno. En el invierno está nevando". (It's snowing in the winter. In the winter it's snowing.)

Clothes

Students were asked to identify a particular type of clothing. There were four rows with three pictures of clothing in each row. The pictures of the clothing were in color so students received a clue by color as well as by clothing. For example, "La corbata es roja". (The tie is red).

Example: " los zapatos" (the shoes) "la corbata" (thé tie) "los calcetines" (the socks)

The Day

Students were asked to identify the period of day in pictures of the morning, afternoon and evening. The phrase also included hints to the type of climate that went along with the picture. For example, "Hace viento por la noche." (It's windy at night.) There were three rows with three pictures in each row.

Example: "Hace fresco por la mañana". (It's fresh in the morning.)
◊
"Está nublado por la tarde" (It's cloudy in the afternoon.)
◊
"Hace viento por la noche". (It's windy at night.)
◊

The Week

Students were asked to listen to a Spanish day of the week and then select its English equivalency. There were four rows with three English words listed. The students would hear for example, "martes" (Tuesday) and then bubble under Tuesday as the correct response.

Example: Sunday Tuesday Friday
◊ ◊ ◊

The Months

Students were asked to translate the Spanish month by selecting its English equivalency. There were also four rows of three English months in each row. The students would hear for example, "noviembre" (November) and then bubble in the correct month in English.

Example: "noviembre" (November) "septiembre" (September) "enero" (January)
◊ ◊ ◊

People

And finally, the students were asked to identify the correct person in three rows of three distinct people.

Example: "la abuela" (the grandmother) "el tío" (the uncle) " la nieta" (the granddaughter)
◊ ◊ ◊

APPENDIX M

MESA PUBLIC SCHOOLS MISSION STATEMENT, PHILOSOPHY, AND STUDENT GOALS

MESA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of foreign language study is to provide all students with new linguistic experiences and varied cultural perspectives. A foundation of second language skills and multi-cultural understandings promotes the development of informed citizens who can better appreciate and function in their own community and in the world at large.

PHILOSOPHY

We believe that language is central to the understanding of culture. In a changing world, a knowledge of foreign languages and culture is essential. In addition, the ability to communicate in other languages gives one access to the wider social, political and economic world. The study of other languages also develops greater competence in and (sic) awareness of one's own language and culture.

STUDENT GOALS

Demonstrate the ability to communicate in a foreign language.
Demonstrate an interest in the languages and cultures of other people.
Demonstrate a knowledge and appreciation of at least one language and culture other than his/her own native language and culture.
Demonstrate a knowledge of the processes involved in learning a second language.

(Source: Foreign Language (K-12) Strategic Curriculum Review and Planning Committee Report Presented to The Governing Board of Mesa Public Schools February 18,1997)

APPENDIX N

ELEMENTARY FOREIGN LANGUAGE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

ELEMENTARY FOREIGN LANGUAGE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

District Name:_____

District Address:_____

Contact Person:_____

Phone:

President of the Local Governing Board

_____

(Signature)

Chief Administrator of the District

_____

(Signature)

1. The district has developed a plan for implementing Elementary Foreign Language instruction. Yes___ No___

2. Check the Elementary Foreign Language Program Model(s) your district will implement.

____ FOREIGN LANGUAGE EXPERIENCE (FLEX)
____ FOREIGN LANGUAGE IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS (FLES)
____ TWO WAY BILINGUAL
____ PARTIAL IMMERSION
____ IMMERSION

3. Has the district coordinated and articulated the elementary foreign language program with the high school program? Yes____No___

4. The district will conduct an inservice training program for teachers. Yes____No___

Give type: Regional Center___District Developed___Other___

5. Please complete the following information regarding your elementary foreign language program. Language(s):_____ Grade level(s):_____
Frequency:_____ Allocated time:_____

6. The district has developed a process for continuous evaluation of student proficiency on the Foreign Language Essential Skills. Yes___No___

The District Elementary Foreign Language Implementation Plan is due June 30,1992 to the Arizona Department of Education, Foreign Language Instruction, 1535 W. Jefferson, Phoenix, AZ 85007. (Use additional pages if necessary)

(Source: The researcher received a copy of the plan sheet from the Arizona Department of Education and retyped the information.)

APPENDIX O

ELEMENTARY PROGRAM

*The following is a section of the Action Plan given to the The Governing Board of Mesa Public Schools on February 18, 1997 as a Committee Report for Foreign Language (K-12) Strategic Curriculum Review and Planning.

Elementary Programs

•Ensure that all students in grades 1 through 5 have access to instruction in a foreign language *(SSRC, resource teachers; working with elementary principals and teachers)*

• Develop exploratory language program to expand foreign language instruction to grades 6 and 7 *(SSRC, resource teachers, elementary and junior high school teachers)*

•Request waiver from the state of the 8th grade foreign language mandate, to allow an alternative model. This will allow a full foreign language program for all students when selected by the student and his/her family. *(SSRC, Superintendency, Governing Board)*

•Seek support from Spanish speakers in the community for elementary teachers, especially in upper grades *(SSRC, resource teachers, elementary teachers)*

*Source: The researcher retyped the section "Elementary Programs" from the actual report given on February 18, 1997. A copy of the report was given to me May 23rd from the chairperson of the committee.

APPENDIX P

RESOURCES FOR FLES

Bookstores

•Nana's Book Warehouse
1-800-737-NANA
Local Phone & Fax (619)-357-4271
848 Heber Ave.
Calexico, CA 92231

Their books are classified by age and reading level and each book title tells whether the book is bilingual, in Spanish or in English.

•Niños
1-800-634-3304
P.O. Box 1163
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1163

They have bilingual operators and accept school purchase orders. Featured in their 1997 Spring-Summer edition of the Niños catalog you will find new additions like the Spanish edition of "Goosebumps", Spanish edition of Disney's "Toy Story", and a Spanish Encyclopedia on CD-ROM.

•Bueno
29481 Manzanita Dr.
Campo, CA 91906
(629)478-5363.

This booklet lists Spanish books like crossword puzzles, dictionaries, advertisements, trips to Spain, translations of Americanisms, recipes, stories in English with content Spanish words, addresses of where to receive free and inexpensive materials, poetry, computer software, etc.

•Hispanic Book Distributor
(520) 690-0643
1238 W. Prince
Tucson, AZ 85705

This store carries bilingual and Spanish books for children, young adults and adults. They also have teacher resource guides, books and tapes and are open from 8-5 Monday-Friday and some Saturdays from 9-2.

Journals/Newsletters/Articles

•Learning Languages
The Journal of the National Network for Early Language Learning (NNELL).

This is published three times a year (fall, winter, and spring). Membership dues for NNELL include a subscription to the journal by academic year and are $15 dollars a year. The journal includes information, ideas, and concerns among teachers, administrators, researchers, and other interested in the early learning of languages.

•ALL Newsletter
The Newsletter of Advocates for Language Learning (ALL).
P.O. Box 4962
Culver City, CA 90231
Tel: (310) 398-4103
Fax: (310) 397-3443

•EJ 474 508 Vetter, Ronald M. (Dec. 1992). "Second Language Learning Through Puppetry." *Guidelines*; v13 n2 p.57-67.

•EJ 407 071 Bennett, Ruth L. (Mar. 1990) "Authentic Materials for the FLES Class." *Hispania*; v73 n1 p259-61.

•EJ 432 943 Rosenbusch, Marcia H. (Sep. 1991) "Elementary School Foreign Language: The Establishment and Maintenance of Strong Programs." *Foreign Language Annals*, v24 n4 p.297-314.

•EJ 367 538 Rhodes, Nancy C.; Oxford, Rebecca L. "Foreign Languages in Elementary and Secondary Results of a National Survey." *Foreign Language Annals*, v21 n1 (Feb 1988) p.51-69.

•ED 355 828 Lipton, G. (1998). *Practical Handbook to Elementary Foreign Language Programs. Including FLES, FLEX, and Immersion Programs*. 223p.

•Curtain, H. and Pesola, C.A. (1994). *Languages and Children: Making the Match*. (2nd ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.

National Foreign Language Conferences

•Advocates for Language Learning (ALL) [see address above]. Held annually in mid-October and in conjunction with ACTFL. ALL is an organizational member of the Joint National Committee for Languages and the Council for Languages and Other International Studies (JNCL/NCLIS).

•American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL), 6 Executive Plaza, Yonkers, NY 10701. Held annually in mid-November.

•Second Language Acquisition by Children (SLAC). Rosemarie A. Benya, East Central University, Ada, OK 74820-6899. Held every eighteen months in November with ACTFL, or in March.

APPENDIX Q

ELEMENTARY FOREIGN LANGUAGE ENDORSEMENT

REQUIREMENTS FOR THE ELEMENTARY FOREIGN LANGUAGE ENDORSEMENT - Grades K-8, optional

There are three options. You must meet all of the requirements for one option in order to qualify.

Option 1:
- A valid Arizona Elementary, Secondary or Special Education certificate
- Proficiency in speaking, reading and writing a language other than English to be verified in writing by the foreign language department of a regionally accredited institution. Native American language proficiency to be verified in writing by an official designated by the appropriate tribe
- Three semester hours in the methods of teaching a foreign or second language at the elementary level
- Three semester hours in child development

Option 2:
- A valid Arizona Elementary, Secondary or Special Education certificate
- An Arizona Bilingual Education endorsement
- Three semester hours in child development

Option 3:
- A valid Arizona Elementary, Secondary or Special Education certificate
- An Arizona English as a Second Language (ESL) endorsement
- Proficiency in speaking, reading and writing a language other than English to be verified in writing by the appropriate language department of a regionally accredited institution; Native American language proficiency to be verified in writing by an official designated by the appropriate tribe
- Three semester hours in child development

Source: The researcher acquired this information via a handout from the Arizona Department of Education -- Certification Unit: Endorsements
ADE 134-221, Rev. 1/97 p. 5

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Lorraine Mills Taylor was born in Worland, Wyoming, on July 9, 1960. She received her elementary through high school education at Ten Sleep School. In 1980, Lorraine graduated with an Associate of Arts from Northwest Community College in Powell, Wyoming. She then transferred to Brigham Young University to complete her Bachelor of Science Degree in Elementary Education with a Minor in Special Education and an Extra-Major-Skill in Spanish. Lorraine taught for one year in the fourth and another in the third grade in Byron, Wyoming, at Byron Elementary School. She then served a welfare mission to the Chile Osorno Mission for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints for 19 months. Upon her return to the states, she completed a Middle School Certification in Spanish and Social Studies in 1987 at Brigham Young University. She then went to work in Mesa, Arizona, at Adams Elementary in the Third Grade where she is currently employed. In 1987 she helped start a Spanish Club for children after school. It is currently in its eleventh year of operation at Adams Elementary. During the summer of 1989 Lorraine received a King Juan Carlos I Fellowship in conjunction with the University of Minnesota to study for six weeks in Madrid, Spain, at the Universidad Complutense, Ciudad Universitaria: Campus de La Moncloa. In 1990, she had the opportunity to work with the Educational Television Department for Mesa Public Schools and help them pilot a video program called *Saludos* and through ASSET (Arizona School Services through Educational Technology) teach Spanish via satellite for the Effective Use of Educational Television in the Classroom program. Lorraine started her Masters Degree in Spanish Applied Linguistics at Arizona State University in the Spring of 1992. In December of 1993 Lorraine volunteered to assist Dr. Albert F. Olivier and a host of doctors from around the United States through the local rotary organization by translating for the medical profession in Guaymas, Mexico. During the summer of 1995 she did a two and a half week study in Cuernavaca and Mexico City, Mexico to complete research for a graduate Spanish course. Lorraine attended the ACTFL , ALL, and SLAC Conferences in November of 1995 to gather data for her thesis and learn about foreign language programs across the United States. In 1996 she was selected by one of her former students to be a part of *Who's Who Among America's Teachers*. Lastly, she is currently a member of Phi Kappa Phi Honor Society, MEA (Mesa Education Association), NNELL (National Network for Early Language Learning), and ACTFL (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages).